DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 300 EA 005 404

TITLE	Annual Evaluation Report on Education Programs: Fiscal Year 1972.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Mar 73
NOTE	333p.; Part of the document may reproduce poorly, especially pages 76 and 197
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education Programs; Annual Reports; Educational Objectives; *Educational Programs; *Educational Research; Educational Technology; Elementary Education; Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; *Federal Programs; Higher Education; Library Programs; Professional Training; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Special Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Office of Education

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive report on the 82 Office of Education programs is provided in this evaluation of the programs for fiscal year 1972. The status of the evaluation function itself is briefly discussed; a general overview is made of the effectiveness of the Office of Education programs; the highlights of new findings from recent evaluation studies are discussed; and the Federal education programs that had been started and were in process during FY 1972 are shown. Evaluation reports are provided for each of the educational programs and legislative titles. These reports appear under the program categories: Elementary and Secondary Education, Education for the Handicapped, Vocational and Adult Education, Higher Education, Education Professions Development, Libraries, Educational Technology, Special Demonstration, Educational Research and Development, and Educational Dissemination. Each program is presented in the same format: Program Name, Legislation, Expiration Data; Funding History, Program Purpose and Operation, Program Effectiveness, Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies, and Sources of Data. An appendix contains an extract from the FY 1971 Annual Evaluation Report on a general overview of the effectives of the Office of Education program. (For related document, see ED 065 738.) (Author/DN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082300

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS
FISCAL YEAR 1972

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation

March 1973

EA 005 404

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

TO : Addressees

DATE: 23 AUG 1973

FROM : Assistant Commissioner for
Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation

SUBJECT: FY 72 Annual Evaluation Report to Congress on Education Programs

The enclosed copy of the FY 72 Annual Evaluation Report to Congress on Education Programs is forwarded for your information. The report provides an overview of what we know about the effectiveness of programs administered by the Commissioner of Education as well as summary descriptions and effectiveness data on each of the approximately 100 OE programs. I hope you will find this a useful and informative document.

Bert Mogin for
John W. Evans

Enclosure

ADDRESSEES:

Deputy Commissioners, OE
Associate & Assistant Commissioners, OE
ASE
Deputy ASE's
ASPE
AS (Legislation)
Regional Commissioners
Chief State School Officers
CEIS (Evaluation Subcommittee)
Congressional Committee Staff Members
Educational Policy Centers

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY 1972

Table of Contents

Page

I. Introduction

A. Background.. 1
B. A General Overview of the Effectiveness of OE Programs.. 2
C. Highlights of New Findings.................................. 4
D. Studies in Process.. 14

II. Detailed Descriptions and Effectiveness Information.......... 30

A. Elementary and Secondary Education Programs.............. 31

1. Education of Disadvantaged Children.................. 32
2. Supplementary Educational Centers and Services....... 45
3. Strengthening State Departments of Education......... 50
4. Bilingual Education.................................. 53
5. Follow Through....................................... 57
6. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Maintenance and Operation.......................... 61
7. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Construction..................................... 66
8. Emergency School Assistance.......................... 70
9. Equal Educational Opportunities, Title IV CRA........ 81

B. Education for the Handicapped Programs.................. 84

1. State Grant Program.................................. 85
2. Aid to States for Education of Handicapped Children in State Operated Schools............... 87
3. Regional Resource Centers............................ 90
4. Deaf/Blind Centers................................... 92
5. Early Childhood Education............................ 94
6. Special Education Manpower Development............... 96
7. Recruitment and Information.......................... 98
8. Innovation and Development........................... 100
9. Media Services and Captioned Films................... 103
10. Specific Learning Disabilities...................... 105

C. Vocational and Adult Education Programs................. 107

1. Vocational and Technical Education: Basic Grants to States.. 108

Page

C. Vocational and Adult Education Programs Cont'd.

2. Vocational and Technical Education: Programs for Students with Special Needs........................ 116
3. Vocational and Technical Education: Research and Training... 118
4. Vocational and Technical Education: Exemplary Programs. 121
5. Vocational and Technical Education: Consumer and Homemaking Education.................................. 124
6. Vocational and Technical Education: Cooperative Education Programs.................................. 126
7. Vocational and Technical Education: Work Study Programs... 128
8. Vocational and Technical Education: Curriculum Development.. 130
9. Adult Basic Education: Basic Grants to States.......... 132
10. Adult Basic Education: Special Projects............... 135
11. Adult Basic Education: Teacher Training............... 137
12. Manpower Development and Training Programs............. 139

D. Higher Education Programs.................................. 144

1. Educational Opportunity Grants Program................. 145
2. College Work-Study Program............................ 148
3. Cooperative Education Program......................... 151
4. Guaranteed Student Loan Program....................... 153
5. National Defense Student Loan Program................. 156
6. Upward Bound Program.................................. 160
7. Educational Talent Search Program...................... 164
8. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students............ 166
9. Strengthening Developing Institutions.................. 168
10. Annual Interest Grants................................. 170
11. Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities... 172
12. State Administration and Planning...................... 174
13. Foreign Language and Areas Centers, Research and Studies... 176
14. Fulbright-Hays Act..................................... 180
15. Community Service and Continuing Education Program...... 183
16. Land Grant Colleges and Universities.................. 185
17. NDEA Fellowship Programs.............................. 187
18. EPDA, Part E Fellowships.............................. 189
19. EPDA, Part E Institutes................................ 192
20. Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities.......... 194

Page

E. Education Professions Development Programs....................... 196

1. Attracting Qualified Persons to the Field of Education....... 197
2. Teacher Corps Program..................................... 199
3. State Grant Program for Attracting and Qualifying Teachers.. 204
4. Educational Leadership Program............................ 206
5. Career Opportunities Program.............................. 208
6. Early Childhood Program................................... 211
7. School Personnel Utilization Program...................... 213
8. Special Education Program................................. 216
9. Training of Teacher Trainers Program...................... 219
10. Pupil Personnel Services Program.......................... 221
11. Urban/Rural School Development Program................... 224
12. Teacher Training in Developing Institutions Program.......... 227
13. Vocational Education Personnel Program.................... 230

F. Library Programs.. 234

1. Library Services... 235
2. Public Library Construction................................ 239
3. Interlibrary Cooperative Services.......................... 241
4. Academic Library Resources................................ 243
5. Career Training - Libraries................................ 245
6. Library Demonstrations..................................... 248
7. School Library Resources................................... 250
8. Undergraduate Instructional Equipment...................... 253
9. Equipment and Minor Remodeling............................ 255

G. Educational Technology Programs............................... 259

1. Educational Broadcasting Facilities........................ 260
2. Sesame Street and Electric Company........................ 262
3. Media Specialist Program................................... 264
4. Special Technology Demonstrations.......................... 266

H. Special Demonstration Programs................................ 268

1. Right-to-Read... 269
2. Drug Abuse Education....................................... 273
3. Environmental Education.................................... 276
4. Nutrition and Health....................................... 279
5. Dropout Prevention... 281

Page

I. Educational Research and Development Programs............. 284

1. Basic Research Program, Including Regional Research... 285
2. Applied Research and Development Program.............. 289
3. Educational Laboratory and R&D Center Program......... 291
4. Research Training Program............................. 294
5. Experimental Schools Program.......................... 297

J. Educational Dissemination Programs...................... 299

1. Spread of Exemplary Practices......................... 300
2. Strengthening State and Local Dissemination Capabilities.. 302
3. Educational Resources Information Centers............. 304
4. Interpretive Summaries................................ 306
5. General Program Dissemination: Office of Public Affairs.. 308

Appendix A.. 310

Extract from FY 1971 Annual Evaluation Report - A General Overview

Annual Evaluation Report on Education
Programs: FY 1972

Introduction

A. Background

Section 413 of the General Education Provisions Act requires that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare transmit to the appropriate legislative and appropriations committees of the Congress "a report evaluating the results and effectiveness of programs and projects assisted thereunder during the preceding fiscal year." Last year marked the first time that a comprehensive report on all Office of Education programs was provided although reports on a number of individual programs had been submitted in previous years. This report encompasses and supercedes these individual reports including those on ESEA Titles I, II, III, V, VII and Civil Rights.

Last year's report was a first effort. It fell far short of providing for each of the approximately 100 OE programs, the kind of rigorous, objective, quantitative evaluation data desirable for good management and program decisions. The absence of such data is due simply to the fact that systematic efforts at evaluating education programs have had only a brief history and without such evaluations there are many gaps in OE's knowledge about program effectiveness. Although the necessary evaluation program to close these gaps has been designed and is now in place, it will take a number of years before all Office of Education programs have been subjected to systematic formal evaluation.

This report is an extension of last year's. It incorporates the findings of approximately 15 evaluation studies completed during the year as well as some additional operational program information. Thus, some of the holes in our knowledge have been closed. FY 73 will see a number of the remaining gaps closed. It should be noted that this report covers OE programs as of June 30, 1972. Subsequent decisions and program information are not reflected which makes the report somewhat historical in nature.

B. General Overview of the Effectiveness of OE Programs

In the first report it was noted that the Federal contribution to American education is a limited one.* By law and tradition, education in the United States is essentially a local enterprise, with the funding for public schools coming largely from local property taxes and the administration of these schools under local authority. The roles of the States vary as does the proportion of State funding, but in general the States are concerned with maintaining minimum requirements for expenditures, teacher qualifications, curricula offerings, student attendance, facilities, etc. The Office of Education presently contributes about 7% and the Federal government as a whole about 12% of the total national expenditures for education.

Although the passage of educational legislation and the creation of educational programs has by and large proceeded in a patch-quilt fashion, the approximately 100 education programs or legislative titles have tended to focus on three basic objectives:

- To equalize education opportunity among groups who are at a disadvantage educationally by reason of economic, racial, cultural, or physical and mental handicapping conditions.

---

* As indicated, this section briefly re-caps the overview presented in last year's report. Readers are directed to Appendix A for the full overview.

- To improve the quality and relevance of American education, primarily through research, experimentation, demonstration, dissemination and training activities.
- To provide limited general support to selected educational functions and activities (such as libraries, State Education Agencies, developing institutions, construction, etc.)

The Education Amendments of 1972 have reformed and expanded the second of these objectives through establishment of the National Institute of Education (NIE). Improving the quality and relevance of American education remains an objective of OE with respect to demonstration and training activities, but the impetus for innovation now moves to the NIE. For this reporting period, FY 1972, it is still designated as an OE responsibility since NIE was not officially established until FY 1973.

The previous report included a broad assessment of how well these three major objectives were being furthered through the variety of programs devoted to them. There is little point in repeating this assessment in detail since the changes in a single year have not been so great as to modify the overall picture. In general, we concluded that:

1) Although the largest Federal thrust has been the attempt to redress various inequalities in educational opportunity, none of the programs individually or all the programs collectively, have yet succeeded in achieving all of their objectives. Nevertheless, the programs in the aggregate seem to have made a substantial

contribution to the goal of equalizing educational opportunity for all American citizens.

2) The research, experimentation, demonstration, dissemination and training activities have not been regarded as highly successful overall despite the fact that a number of notable successes (e.g., development of individually prescribed instruction, the Multi-Level School, Computer Assisted Instruction, Sesame Street and the Electric Company, National Assessment, New Curricula in Physics, English and Math, etc.) have been achieved with individual projects. The cumulative effect of the many shortcomings in the Federal educational R&D effort over the years has led to the establishment of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and the transfer of OE responsibility in this area to the NIE (Public Law 92-318, 92nd Congress - Education Amendments of 1972).

3) The provision of selected general support has helped schools and colleges meet operational requirements in such areas as impact aid, construction and equipment programs, basic grants to States for vocational and adult education, aid to land grant colleges, public library programs and the purchase of school and college library materials. However, the Federal role in supporting operational activities is considered a very limited one and a number of these programs have been recommended for reduction or elimination.

C. Highlights of New Findings

As indicated above, a number of evaluation studies were completed during the year which provided new information about the impact or effectiveness of the programs studied. This section provides summary descriptions of the highlights of these studies:

1) Education of Disadvantaged Children - ESEA, Title I. A recently completed reanalysis and synthesis of evaluation data on ESEA Title I from 1965 through 1970 by American Institutes for Research concluded that:

   a) Most SEA's and many LEA's have failed to implement their programs in full compliance with existing regulations, guidelines, and program criteria.

   b) Funds and services have been underallocated for academic programs, overallocated for supportive services, and misallocated to children who do not have specific critical needs for the programs and services received.

   c) No studies have yet shown that the Title I program had a positive nationwide impact on participating children. There is evidence, however, of positive program impact on children in several States and about 100 local projects were identified as having produced significant cognitive benefits. This state of affairs in regard to impact may partially be due to the poor quality of most available evaluation reports.

   d) No definitive conclusion can be reached on the effectiveness of the compensatory education program intended by ESEA, Title I until the national, state, and local programs and projects are in full compliance with regulations guidelines and program criteria.

A study was conducted by the National Bureau of Standards to assess the effect of the 1970 census on the allocation of Title I funds and to consider various alternatives for the Title I formula.
An interim report concluded that the distribution of the funds for the Program of Special Incentive Grants under Part B - Title I provided funds in such small amounts as to make the program ineffective. The report also notes that Part C of Title I which provides special grants for urban and rural schools in areas with highest concentrations of poor children is also ineffective because the level of funding has only a slight impact on the national distribution of Title I funds.

2) Emergency School Assistance Program. A study to assess the impact of ESAP I school district grants on desegregation conducted by the Resource Management Corporation found that the vast majority of respondents (principals, teachers, students, ESAP Project Directors) felt that the racial climate had changed for the better or had remained the same (not worsened). A number of ESAP activities funded by the grants showed a positive relationship to racial change counseling, student programs, and remedial programs. Surprisingly, teacher training activities were not effective although they were frequently chosen and expensive.

3) Innovation and Development Program - Education of the Handicapped. An evaluation to review the management of the program concluded that the program itself has successfully demonstrated how children with

various kinds of handicaps including mental retardation, visual handicap and hearing handicap - can be taught effectively. However, it found that improvement is needed in three management areas: a) a better definition of program goals and objectives; b) a better selection of research projects for funding; c) tighter monitoring of ongoing research projects.

4) Vocational Education Program (Basic Grants to States.) A study to assess the impact of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments or target groups (vocational students and vocational schools) examined publically funded skill training programs in 20 cities. Partial results indicate that labor market conditions have an even stronger influence on earnings of vocational education students that had previously been recognized. In periods of low unemployment, employers tend to seek out vocational graduates and utilize their school training as the basis for more specialized on-the-job training. Vocational graduates tend to earn more than academic or general education students during such periods. However, in periods of rising unemployment the advantage diminishes as persons with greater work experience compete for the same jobs as graduates with little or no experience.

Another study designed to compare proprietary and non-proprietary vocational training programs examined student outcomes in office, health, computer and technical occupations. The findings indicated some differences. Although 78% of the graduates of both programs sought training-related jobs and about 75% of the seekers found them, less than 20% of the proprietary school alumni and only 13% of the non-proprietary school alumni obtained jobs through school placement services. This was surprising since job placement is a service promoted by proprietary schools. Of the employed alumni, 34% of the proprietary and 12% of the non-proprietary group felt the training was not worth the money.

5) Adult Education - Grants to States. A longitudinal study of a national sample of Adult Basic Education (ABE) students were initiated to determine student characteristics and to assess program effectiveness. Initial findings indicated that on the basis of skills test given at four to five month intervals, reading gains were five-tenths of a grade level, and math gains were three-tenths of a grade level. Twenty six percent gained a full grade or more in reading and twenty percent did so in math. Thus, the gains being achieved by this program appear to be substantial, especially when compared to the typically much smaller gains shown by early childhood remediation programs. But the study also found that the motivation for attending classes was primarily educational rather than job-related. Less than half the students were unemployed and less than twenty percent have had serious problems in finding jobs. Most of those who were unemployed felt that completing the basic program would significantly improve their job chances.

6) Manpower Development and Training Act Program. A study of over 5000 former MDTA participants who exited the program in 1969 examined

their employment and earning gains to determine if MDTA made a difference. The study found that median gains in annual income following participation in MDTA was $1876 for institutional enrollees and $1614 for those receiving on-the-job training. Thus, MDTA was judged to make a significant difference producing higher wages, improved employment stability and increased labor force participation. Further, it was found that twenty-seven percent of the disadvantaged participants raised their income above the poverty level ($4000 for a family of four). Although gains varied significantly by personal and group characteristics, the greatest gains occurred for Spanish-Americans and in construction and health fields, and the longer the training period, the higher was the average annual gain.

7) Special Services for Disadvantaged Students. A three phase study of the Special Services Program was initiated to assess the coverage, impact and effectiveness of the program. The first phase report indicates that 14% of all undergraduates at all colleges come from families classified as at the poverty level. Only 20% of all colleges, however, have supportive special services type programs and only 47,000 students are being served, less than 5% of the total estimated student population requiring such services. The next phase of the study is assessing the effectiveness of the program in reducing the attrition rate of the financially disadvantaged undergraduates participating in the program. One key program element, academic counseling, seems to be an effective technique

according to preliminary results.

8) Teacher Corps. Among the objectives of the Teacher Corps are: 1) attracting and retaining bright young people to the teaching profession who would not ordinarily select teaching careers; 2) providing educational services to disadvantaged children and 3) changing teacher preparation programs. Several studies have examined these objectives.
One preliminary survey of Teacher Corps interns completed in August 1972 indicated that 63% intended to remain in the field of education with 27% teaching in the school districts where they served their internships. A second study conducted by the GAO indicated that the program was successful in strengthening the educational services provided disadvantaged children in schools where Teacher Corps members were assigned. Primarily, the program provided more opportunity for individualized instruction as well as extracurricular and out-of-school activities. The GAO study also indicated that the program had some success in broadening teacher preparation programs in participating colleges and universities. Still another study found too much inflexibility in academic courses offered to interns, and also found that community involvement in projects was superficial. Undue emphasis was being placed on change in academic training programs as opposed to change in school systems.

9) Educational Leadership Program. A recently completed evaluation concluded that there have been significant achievements on the program's three major goals: 1) to develop training programs appropriate to major urban systems; 2) to recruit potential administrators from new and varied manpower sources; and 3) to place them in inner-city schools and other schools having similar socio-economic characteristics. Extensive involvement between cities and their proximate universities has been achieved in recruitment, training and placement. The projects designed to attract successful persons from other professions have received national recognition with 60% of the participants recruited being minority group members.

10) Career Opportunities Program. An evaluation to assess the impact and results the program found that:

- COP aides are representative of the target population and are strongly motivated to become teachers. They view the program as a vehicle for upward mobility.
- Superintendents, principals, teachers and aides are well satisfied with the program.
- Principles desire more COP aides whom they view as more professional than other teacher aides and as providing more opportunity for individualized instruction to students.

- Superintendents view the aides as effective links between the schools and community groups.
- Institutions of higher education report changes in teacher preparation courses and methods as a result of COP experiences.
- State Education Agencies show changes in credentialling requirements to accommodate COP aides.

11) Early Childhood Program - EPDA Part D. An evaluation of this program found that:
This program supports projects to train and retrain educational personnel for programs for young children, ages 3-9. An evaluation found that there is weakness in the involvement of community representatives in the projects. More significantly it found that while the training projects are designed to fill critical shortages in the field, only 44% of the participants expect to be employed as early childhood teachers on completion of training.

12) Educational Broadcasting Facilities. The program is designed to provide for the purchase of transmission equipment for noncommercial public educational broadcasting facilities - radio and television. Surveys have indicated that noncommercial ETV facilities have tripled and educational radio stations have increased by 50% since 1963. Fifty-three percent of all elementary and secondary schools now have capability to receive instructional telecasts.

Thus, many of the goals of the legislation are being achieved.

D. Studies in Process

As indicated, the evaluation of Federal education programs is now a continuous activity. The following table shows those that had been started and were in process during FY 1972.

EVALUATION STUDIES IN PROCESS
DURING FISCAL YEAR 1972

EVALUATION STUDIES IN PROCESS, FY 1972

Area Title Scope and Purpose	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
Elementary and Secondary Education				
1. Study of the ESEA Title I Grant Formula and Sub-Allocation Procedures This study, required by the 1970 amendments to ESEA, compares the existing Title I formula and sub-allocation procedures with various alternatives to see if other allocation procedures might be more in keeping with legislative intent.	National Bur of Standards	March 1973	$ 129,000	$ 370,000
2. Study of the Use of Incentives in Education. This study is assessing the effectiveness of incentives to parents and teachers as a mechanism for improving student performance. Field experiments are being conducted and assessed at four sites: Cincinatti, Ohio; Duval County, Florida; Oakland, California; and San Antonio, Texas.	Planar Corp & Educational Turnkey, Inc.	Oct 1972 July 1972	62,056 33,986	313,494 233,986
3. Title I Management Analysis. The Title I guidelines provide the principal means for the Federal government to affect local spending of compensatory education funds. A two part study is being conducted. Phase I is an assessment of existing data relative to the data needed to formulate guideline decisions. Phase II is the initiation of an on-site nationally representative survey to fill in the data gaps as determined in Phase I.	Planar Corp	Dec 1973	160,000	225,000

	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
4. Analytic Study of Secondary Education in the United States. There has not been a comprehensive report on secondary education since the Conant reports. This study will prepare an analytic report to provide: (1) a status report on secondary education in the U.S.; (2) an identification and analysis of the problems of adolescent education; (3) an analysis of proposals for reform and renewal; and (4) a description of policy issues, research and development programs which would provide needed knowledge and information.	John Henry Martin, Asst.	June 1973	$ 135,000	$ 170,000
5. Effects of Income Maintenance on Education. This evaluation attempts to determine if increased family income is significantly associated with education performance. The experimental design includes a battery of achievement and attitude tests to children of families participating in the HEW Income Maintenance Program. Comparison is being made with a control group.	Urban/Inst.	1975	30,000	200,000
6. A Process Evaluation of the Bilingual Program. This study is collecting data on the management of the Bilingual program. Information is being gathered on the characteristics of the various kinds of projects, the participants, teachers, etc. This phase will be followed by an impact evaluation.	Small Business Adm./Development Associates	Sept 1973	238,489	278,472
7. Longitudinal Study of Demonstration Programs. This is a detailed study of the effects of large scale, intensive innovative efforts on the achievement and motivational levels of the same students over a three-year period. Most programs were initially supported by Title III, ESEA, and involve some 21,000 students in 15 schools districts.	American Inst. of Research	May 1974	448,347	1,450,000

	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
8. A Large Scale Evaluation of Compensatory Reading and Reading Related Efforts in the Elementary Grades. This study assesses the impact of compensatory reading programs on the development of individual student reading skills. Pre and post tests are being administered to students participating in a national sample of compensatory reading programs (both Title I and non-Title I sponsored).	Educational Testing Service	May 1974	$ 948,910	$ 3,506,991
9. Evaluation of ESAP II School District Program and Study of the Process of School Desegregation. This study in 600 schools is assessing the effectiveness of the ESAP program and the relative effectiveness of different activities funded under the program. The study also is examining the process of desegregation.	National Opinion Research Center	Sept 1973	772,352	772,352

Handicapped Education

	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
1. Evaluation of the Impact of Federal Support for Educational Programs in State Supported Institutions for the Handicapped. This study is assessing the impact of support provided under the provisions of ESEA Title I, as amended by P.L. 89-313. Impact is being measured in terms of (1) increased resources available to the children served by these institutions, (2) the degree of increased quality of institutional education programs, (3) the degree to which children show improved outcomes, and (4) the degree to which Federal funds have a stimulator effect on State funding.	Exotech Systems Inc. Washington, D.C.	12-24-74	$ 198,300	$ 198,300
2. Evaluation of the Program Supporting Training of Teachers of Handicapped Children. This study is examining (1) the impact of Federal grants in increasing the pool of Special Education Teachers and (2) the perceptions of practicing Special Education teachers as to the factors most important in their career choice.	RMC, Inc. Washington, D.C.	2-26-73	2,556	190,806
3. Evaluation of Education of Inner-City Handicapped Children. This study compares the educational services delivered to handicapped inner-city children to those services delivered to non-inner-city children. The project covers case studies in five cities and is attempting to identify special needs of inner-city handicapped children.	Battelle Memorial Inst. Columbia, Ohio	1-15-73	11,670	211,040

	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
4. Evaluation of the State Grant Program for Education of the Handicapped. This study assesses the impact of State grant funds in terms of (a) the extent to which demonstration projects are replicated, (b) the role of Federal funds in stimulating more programs and/or the expansion of services, and (c) the multiplier effect of Federal funds on both State and local funding.	Exotech Systems, Inc. Washington, D.C.	3-15-73	$ 7,980	$ 198,595
5. Study of Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation in Education of the Handicapped. This study is examining the way HEW resources are allocated to handicapped children; analyzing the cost-effectiveness of educational programs for the handicapped; and, utilizing the findings of the study, trying to develop a plan for maximizing the impact of Federal resources.	Rand Corp. Santa Monica, Calif.	2-01-73	415,000	415,000

	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
Vocational and Adult Education				
1. National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972. This study is being carried out to collect data on the characteristics, expectations, attitudes, academic achievements, and work history of a national sample of the high school class of 1972.	Educational Testing Service Princeton, N.J.	4-30-73	$ 912,565*	$ 922,565*
2. Vocational Education Impact Study. This study is aimed at assessing what is currently known about program impact and how well the State grant mechanism functions to implement the priorities of the 1968 Amendments. The study also is examining program gaps and duplications as a means to better coordination.	National Planning Association Washington, D.C.	10-31-72	0	539,000
3. Longitudinal Evaluation of the Adult Basic Education Program. This study provides information on the relationship between past program performance and the kinds of experiences the ABE enrollee receives. It also assesses the State grant mechanism to examine the extent to which the States serve adults in various demographic areas and the extent to which results of innovative projects have been incorporated into regular ABE classes.	System Development Corporation Falls Church, Va.	9-30-73	292,181	317,999

* includes $25,000 from DOD

	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
4. Assessment of Career Guidance, Counseling and Placement. This study is assessing the progress and trends and identifying unmet needs in providing guidance, counseling and placement services for secondary vocational education students. Using case studies the contractor is analyzing developments and problems in operating programs which appear to be suitable for replication.	American Institutes for Research Palo Alto, Calif.	5-30-73	$ 159,906	$ 159,906
5. Evaluation of Work-Education Programs Which Meet Career Development Objectives of Secondary and Post-Secondary Students. The objectives of this study are: (1) to analyze and compare administrative and organizational designs of programs which have work experience components; (2) to examine the purposes and subpurposes of various work-education programs in order to determine similarities and unique differences; (3) to identify, describe, and rank experiences and services present in successful work-education programs, and (4) to identify and interpret existing constraints or limitations in carrying out work-education programs and to determine under what conditions work-education programs may be expanded.	System Development Corporation Santa Monica, Calif.	10-15-73	246,330	246,330

	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
Higher Education				
1. Analysis of Costs and Finances in Institutions of Higher Education - Phase II. This is a continuation of the "Cost of College" study and extends the original sample of 50 colleges to other post-secondary institutions including community colleges, technical schools, etc.	Columbia Research Assoc.	Aug 1972	0	$ 62,295 FY 70 108,365 FY 71 171,660
2. Study of Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility. The purpose of this study is to analyze and critically evaluate the present procedures and methods for determining institutional eligibility for Federal financial assistance. Special attention is being given to the impact and implications of reliance upon accreditation.	Brookings Inst.	June 30, 1973	$ 142,300	$ 142,300
3. Study of Higher Education Facilities Needs and an Economic Analysis of Alternative Financing Methods. This is a study to determine realistic future academic facilities needs. Since reliable estimates of future enrollment up to 1984 already exist the greatest expertise is required in developing reliable planning factors. Some consideration is also being given to the impact of alternative financing methods.	Joseph Froomkin, Inc.	Dec, 1973	132,017	180,000
4. Evaluation of Programs Aimed at Training Personnel to Teach in Institutions of Higher Education. This study will evaluate EPDA Title V-E programs which are intended to train and re-train college administrators and teachers in two- and four-year colleges.	Abt Assoc.	March 1973	0	255,052

	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
5. Survey of Special Programs in Higher Education for Disadvantaged Students. This project is collecting data on the number of disadvantaged students now in higher education and the degree to which they are being served by Federal or other special programs. The study is assessing the effectiveness of such programs in retention of disadvantaged students in college and identifying the characteristics of particularly successful programs.	Educational Testing Service	March 31, 1973	$ 346,847	$ 346,847
6. Projection of Institutional Finances. Projections of revenues and expenditures through 1980 for institutions of higher education under a number of different policy assumptions.	Joseph Froomkin, Inc.	Nov. 1973	57,451	57,451

EVALUATION STUDIES IN PROCESS, FY 1972

Area	Title	Scope and Purpose	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
Education Professions Development						
	1. Process Evaluation of Education Professions Development Program.	A process evaluation of a variety of specialized training programs in the education professions development area to provide data to allow program managers to make proper resource decisions and to improve program management. This study is focusing on matters of program reliability and implementation rather than program impact.	Resource Management Corporation Bethesda, Maryland	Nov. 1972	$140,525	$140,525

EVALUATION STUDIES IN PROCESS, FY 1972

Area	Title	Scope and Purpose	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
Education Professions Development						
2.	Impact Evaluation of Teacher Corps.					
		Phase I of the study will identify intern background characteristics and Teacher Corps program characteristics which correlate most highly with desired intern exit characteristics. The specific intern exit characteristics to be studied are teacher skills, attitudes, and knowledge base which projects believe will facilitate the learning and growth of minority-group and low-income elementary school children. Multivariate statistical procedures will be used to analyze data from 485 interns trained at 10 Teacher Corps elementary school projects.	Contemporary Research, Inc. & System Development Corp., Los Angeles, California	Aug. 30, 1974	$219,722	$501,819

EVALUATION STUDIES IN PROCESS, FY 1972

Area	Title	Scope and Purpose	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
Education Professions Development						
3. Study of National Impact of Training Programs for Elementary and Secondary Teachers. An impact study of a variety of education professions development programs in terms of effects of the program on institutions, trainees and classroom student performance. Programs include those such as Career Opportunities Program, Educational Leadership Program, School Personnel Utilization Program, and other specialized programs falling within the education professions development area. The study is being conducted by a combination of measurement of performance by standardized instruments and case study analyses.			Abt & Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Massachusetts	Jan. 1973	$465,972	$465,972

EVALUATION STUDIES IN PROCESS, FY 1972

Area	Title	Scope and Purpose	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 1972 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
Library Programs						
1.	Evaluation of LSCA to Special Clientele Group	This study surveyed all States to identify Public Library Projects (Planned, Operational, or Terminated) that serve various special clientele groups, e.g. disadvantaged, handicapped, institutionalized, aged. Over 1600 projects were identified and surveyed. 55 site visits were made. The Final Report will show existing and needed efforts in this area.	System Development Corp. Santa Monica, Calif.	April 1973	$237,000	$237,000
2.	The Public Library and Federal Policy	This study will propose alternative Federal postures for Public Library Support and identify data gaps. The study is being accomplished through limited site visits, an advisory council and a Delphi exercise.	System Development Corp. Santa Monica, Calif.	April 1973	$114,000	$114,000

EVALUATION STUDIES IN PROCESS, FY 1972

Area	Title	Scope and Purpose	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
Technology Programs						
Evaluation Planning for the Rocky Mt. Educational Technology Demonstration			Stanford University	Oct. 8, 1973	$112,102	$215,538

The major purposes of this project are:

1) To insure that the Demonstration is planned in terms of measurable objectives, and

2) To provide assistance in all aspects of formative evaluation during the Demonstration's developmental phase.

EVALUATION STUDIES IN PROCESS, FY 1972

Area	Title	Scope and Purpose	Contractor	Estimated Completion Date	FY 72 Cost	Estimated Total Cost
Dissemination and Demonstration	Assessment of NCEC Communications Products	This study was intended to assess the quality and utility of the information analysis products generated by the programs of the NCEC. Such evaluation information provides the necessary basis for effective management control. The results are also applicable to resource allocation and program development.	System Development Corp., Falls Church, Virginia	June 1972	$121,827	$121,827

II. DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION
ON
INDIVIDUAL USOE PROGRAMS

A. Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

1. Education of Disadvantaged Children
2. Supplementary Educational Centers and Services
3. Strengthening State Departments of Education
4. Bilingual Education
5. Follow Through
6. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Maintenance and Operation
7. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Construction
8. Emergency School Assistance
9. Equal Educational Opportunities, Title IV, CRA

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Education of Disadvantaged Children

Legislation: **Expiration Date:**

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended — June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$1,192,581,000	959,000,000
1967	1,430,764,000	1,053,410,000
1968	1,902,136,000	1,191,000,000
1969	2,184,436,000	1,123,127,000
1970	2,409,555,000	1,339,050,000
1971	3,457,408,000	1,500,000,000
1972	4,254,317,000*	1,597,500,000
1973	4,839,950,000*	1,585,185,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Section 101 of P.L. 89-10, as amended through 90th Congress, 1st session states:

> In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local education agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this part) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Administrative responsibilities for Title I are shared by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, State education agencies (SEAs), and local education agencies (LEAs). USOE (1) determines the entitlements of counties and of State education agencies, (2) prorates reduced authorizations on the basis of Congressional appropriations, (3) distributes available funds to SEAs, (4) develops and disseminates regulations, guidleines, and other materials related to administration of Title I, (5) provides monitoring and technical assistance to SEAs (6) compiles fiscal, statistical, and evaluation data, (7) evaluates the results and effectiveness of the program, and (8) receives assurances from SEAs that programs will be administered in accordance with the law and the regulations.

* subject to changes based on recalculation.

Participating SEAs must assure USOE that they will administer the program in their States and submit evaluation and fiscal reports as provided in the law and regulations. Administrative functions of SEAs include (1) approval or disapproval of proposed LEA projects, (2) suballocation of county aggregate grants to grant funds to eligible and participating LEAs, (3) provision of technical assistance to LEAs, (4) maintenance of fiscal records, and (5) preparation of fiscal and evaluation reports for USOE.

In developing, proposing, implementing, and evaluating local projects, LEAs are required to identify areas impacted with high concentrations of children from low-income families, assess the special needs of children in those areas, and design projects that match available resources to identified needs. In addition to these activities, LEAs must keep adequate fiscal records and provide SEAs with annual fiscal and evaluation reports.

Title I enabling legislation and USOE regulations instituted one of the largest Federal-State-local education partnerships in the history of United States education. The legislation authorizes Federal financing of thousands of separate, autonomous, local programs operated and administered by local school boards and approved by the State. 1 and USOE authorities. USOE's primary role is to administer the program without exercising direction, supervision or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, school, or school system. The intent of the law is to let local educational agencies -- the agencies that are most acutely aware of the unique needs of local educationally deprived children -- design and implement projects that will match available resources to local needs.

USOE's strategy for effective administration and operation of Title I at the State level has been to monitor those activities and provide technical assistance to the States as required. Similarly, monitoring and technical assistance activities are the responsibility of SEAs and are meant to insure LEA compliance with the letter and intent of Title I regulations. USOE's monitoring and technical assistance activities are a major component of the effort to improve ESEA Title I program operations at the State and local levels.

Improvement of local project impact on participating students is the goal of two additional strategies, namely, SEA project development/evaluation technical assistance, and USOE identification and dissemination of information about local projects that have demonstrated innovativeness and/or success. SEAs are granted up to one percent of the total State Title I allocation or $150,000, whichever is greater, to monitor and provide technical assistance to LEAs.

Program Effectiveness:

Information on the effectiveness of Title I during the years 1965-1970 is summarized in a research report entitled ESEA Title I: A Reanalysis and Synthesis of Evaluation Data From Fiscal Year 1965 through 1970 (American Institutes for Research, March 1972). The report presents an evaluation of the operation and impact of ESEA Title I since its inception, based on existing evaluation data in local, State-wide and national studies of that five-year period

The report concluded, on the basis of national-level data, that: (a) most States and many school districts have failed to implement their programs in full compliance with existing regulations, guidelines, and program criteria; (b) funds and services have been underallocated for academic programs, over-allocated for supportive services, and mis-allocated to children who do not have specific critical needs for the programs and services received; and (c) there is little evidence at the national level, except for teacher opinion, that the Title I program in those years had a positive impact on participating children. No evidence could be found at the State or local level to counter the conclusions on non-compliance and resource misallocation. Evidence was found, however, of positive program impact on children in a few States, and nearly 100 local projects were identified as having produced significant cognitive benefits. The report notes that no conclusion can be reached on the potential effectiveness of the compensatory education program intended by ESEA Title I until the national and State programs and local projects are in full compliance with regulations, guidelines and program criteria.

The findings on operational context, children's needs, management performance, resource allocation and impact on children may be summarized for the years 1965-1970 as follows:

Operational Context

- Minority group children, children from low-income families, and children attending large city schools have the greatest need for compensatory education education and related services.
- Economically disadvantaged and minority group children are concentrated in a small number of large school distracts that have low to moderate regular per-pupil expenditures.
- Minority group children are more concentrated in Title I schools and more segregated in Title I classrooms than in the nation's schools and classrooms in general.

- Approximately 54% of all children in Title I elementary schools are classified as disadvantaged by their teachers -- 36% economically, 3.5% educationally, and 14% both economically and educationally.

- Severe multiple (economic and educational) and severe economic disadvantagement are primarily minority group problems while educational disadvantagement without accompanying economic disadvantagement is primarily a problem of nonminority groups.

- Children classified as disadvantaged tend to be more concentrated in urban and rural areas than in suburban areas.

- Schools with high concentrations of children from poor families also tend to be concentrated with children classified as disadvantaged educationally, economically, and multiply.

Needs of Children in Title I Elementary Schools

- A significantly higher proportion of children in Title I elementary schools have reading (43%), language (37%), and mathematics (37%) skill deficiencies than the proportion of children with such difficulties in the nation's schools in general.

- A higher proportion of poor and minority group children have critical needs for remedial services in reading, language, and mathematics than their more advantaged and nonminority peers.

- Within Title I elementary schools, reading retardation tends to increase at successive grade levels.

- The greatest need for remedial reading programs is in schools located in urban and rural areas with high concentrations of poor and minority group children.

Management Performance

- Since program inception, HEW and USOE management audits have suggested that most States and many LEAs have failed to implement their program in full compliance with Title I regulations, guidelines, and program criteria.

- State deficiencies in financial control, LEA application review, monitoring, and auditing have resulted in the use of Title I funds for unessential construction and equipment purchases, as general district or school-wide aid, and to supplant other Federal, State and local funds in direct violation of Title I regulations. Further, many LEAs have failed to implement projects designed to meet the critical academic needs of participating children and to involve their community and participating children's parents in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of local projects as required by program criteria. More recent USOE monitoring and technical assistance activities have been directed towards improvement in the above situation.

Resource Allocation

. Low regular-expenditure school districts have higher concentrations of children from low-income families and more critical needs for Title I funds but receive less Title I funding in proportion to their need and in proportion to the number of children in need of services, and serve more children at lower Title I per-pupil expenditures, than moderate and high regular-expenditure districts.

. Although Title I services have been concentrated on children classified as disadvantaged, as minority group members, and as rural and urban school enrollees, funds and services have been under-allocated for academic programs, over-allocated for supportive (nonacademic) services, and misallocated to many children who have no specific critical needs for the programs and services they receive.

Impact on Participating Children

. At the national level, the only evidence that the program from 1965 to 1970 had postive impact on participating children in terms of their academic performance and personal-social behavior was based on teacher opinion. All attempts to obtain impact data based on standardized achievement test scores failed to obtain nationally representative samples. However, the large but unrepresentative data bases obtained consistently failed to demonstrate positive impact.

. Positive cognitive impact was demonstrated by a few States, at some time during the 1965-1970 period, and almost 100 local projects were identified which demonstrated significant cognitive benefits.

- A rapid survey of the 1971 and 1972 State Evaluation Reports on their Title I programs indicates that, in some States, substantial numbers of participating children are making a year or more of cognitive growth per year of schooling. The evidence presented in these State reports needs validation and in-depth analysis, and OE is planning to provide them. If the evidence proves to be valid, it would indicate considerable program impact in the aggregate and would substantially modify many of the indications on program effectiveness of the AIR report cited above. Five examples of the State-reported evidence of program effectiveness follow:

(1) The Michigan State Report for Fiscal Year 1972 indicates that a non-random sample of Title I programs shows average gains per month of programming of 1.3 months in reading and 1.3 months in mathematics. The report states that "... the gains indicate that the average Michigan Title I student in regular school year programs has begun to narrow the gap between Title I basic skills achievement and the national average basic skills achievement." The report also claims that "... the gains made in summer and extended school year programs were even greater than those made in regular school year programs." The report also notes that samples used in analysis of basic skills achievement were selected on the basis of available data and may not be representative of Title I programs in Michigan, points out that gain scores from various tests were combined for analysis, and indicates possible errors resulting from the statistical techniques used.

(2) The California State Report for Fiscal Year 1972 indicates that Title I students at all grade levels, as an average, attained more than one month's growth in reading skills for each month of instruction. It also reported that a majority of Title I students achieved gains equal to or more than one month's growth in mathematics for each month's participation in the Title I program.

(3) The Alabama State Report for Fiscal Year 1972 indicates a State-wide testing program in grades 4, 8 and 11. Results for a large sample of students for whom pre-test and post-test scores were available showed an average gain in reading and math skills of over one year. The average gain in 1971 was eight months.

(4) The Kansas State Report for Fiscal Year 1972 notes that an average of 57.3% at all grade levels, of a large sample of students in the remedial reading program, made gains of one month or more per month of instruction. In a much smaller sample of students in the remedial mathematics program, an average of 61.2% at all grade levels made gains of one

month or more per month of instruction. The report also points out that the percentage of students in the upper grades who made gains of one month or more per month of instruction in reading is greater than the percentage in the lower grades.

(5) New York State conducted a special survey to identify Title I projects whose participants were achieving in reading and mathematics at a faster rate than had occurred before Federal funds were made available for remedial services. For a small sample of pupils at all grades levels so identified and for whom predicted post-test means were available, it was reported that mean growth in reading increased from .59 months of growth per month of school before participation in the Title I program to .99 months of growth per month of school after such participation. A similarly small sample of participants for whom predicted post-test means were not available showed a 1.65-months of growth in reading per month of school after such participation. Much smaller samples of students at all grade levels in Title I mathematics programs and for whom predicted post-test means were available showed increases in mean growth from .63 months of growth per month of school before participation to 1.38 months of growth per month of school after such participation; there were gains of 1.94 months of growth in mathematics per month of school after participation for students for whom predicted post-test means were not available. The report's conclusion regarding these small samples of students is that" ... selected ESEA I treatments appear to have promoted an end to continued deterioration in basic skills for some pupils and also to have helped additional pupils catch up to their peers."

The Title I Allocation Formula

An "on-going," detailed study of the Title I resource allocation process by the National Bureau of Standards is nearing completion. Entitled The Process of Funds Allocation Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the study was mandated by the 1970 Amendments to ESEA (P.L. 91-230, Section 102). An Interim Report of March 1972 presents tentative conclusions on some of the issues in the Congressional mandate. The Part B--Title I Program of Special Incentive Grants to State educational agencies, based on the State's "effort index" for the preceding fiscal year, has been funded at a level at which grants to qualifying States have been too small to provide an effective fiscal incentive *per se*. Limitations on program effectiveness result from several factors in addition to underfunding, such as eligibility criteria, State budgetary processes relative to time lags in grant awards, year-to-year variability, and the imposition of ceilings on grant amounts. The conclusion is that the Congressional intent underlying the incentive grant program has not been fulfilled, that the program has been ineffective, and that the program would probably be ineffective at any anticipated funding level in its current form.

Part C of Title I provides special grants for urban and rural schools in areas with the highest concentrations of poor children. In order to qualify for a grant under Part C, a school district must have enough poor children so that their percentage in the district exceeds an established percentage threshold (20% of the school-age population) or their absolute number exceeds an established number (5,000 such children who comprise 5% or more of the school-age population). Experience with Part C to-date is inconclusive because of its level of funding ($15.4 million in Fiscal Year 1971 and $24.8 million in Fiscal Year 1972; the largest grant in Fiscal Year 1972 was nearly $4.2 million to New York, the smallest grant was $1,026 to New Hampshire).

The conclusion for Fiscal Year 1971, nonetheless, was that total Part C grants were in an amount too small to have any appreciable influence on the characteristics of the national distribution of Title I monies. USOE does not compute authorization amounts for Part C grants, with the result that we do not know what effect a higher Title I funding level would have on the pattern of national distribution.

Besides the relatively slight effect on distribution characteristics of Title I, Part C presents a second effectiveness problem. This relates to the cut-off levels of percentage or absolute number of poor children in the district which, in effect, rigidly bifurcate concentration levels in an apparently arbitrary fashion. It seems more appropriate to implementation of the legislative intent that there be a range of financial assistance to districts with high concentrations of poor children. Thus, as the concentration of poor children increases, per-capita income decreases as does the "ability to pay," leading to a decrease in average per-pupil expenditure. As concentration of poor children increases, however, the need for compensatory-education funds also increases. The fact that these needs and relationships exist on a continuous scale argues that the Title I formula for Part C should reflect this situation so that the legislative intent of Part C may be properly implemented.

The final report of this study will further address the issues of (1) how effective is the allocation formula in making Title I funds available to States and to local educational agencies within counties, and (2) how appropriate is the Federal percentage and the low-income factor, in addition to final considerations on the special incentive grants under Part B and the concentration grants under Part C.

Comparability in Title I Districts

A major issue in Title I is the comparability of school-district expenditures by school building between Title I and non-Title I schools. This issue results from the legislative requirements of section 141(a)(3)(C) of Public Law 91-230, which states that: "State and local funds will be used in the district of such agency to provide services in project areas which, taken as a whole, are at least comparable to services being provided in areas in such district which are not receiving funds under this title: Provided, that any finding of noncompliance with this clause shall not affect the payment of funds to any local educational agency until the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972, and Provided further, that each local educational agency receiving funds under this title shall report on or before July 1, 1971, and on or before July 1 of each year thereafter with respect to its compliance with this clause." In determining whether comparability exists for school districts and for school buildings within districts, the Office of Education has applied five criteria of comparability since their publication in the Federal Register on October 14, 1971. Those five criteria are: (1) ratio of pupils to certified classroom teachers; (2) ratio of pupils to other certified instructional staff; (3) ratio of pupils to non-certified instructional staff; (4) instructional salaries excluding longevity pay; (5) other instructional costs. School districts which receive Title I funds and which are required to report on comparability were asked to submit data applicable to Fiscal Year 1973 Title I schools and, if appropriate, plans for corrective action to achieve comparability.

Although State Education Agencies have the primary responsibility for reviewing school-district comparability reports, the Office of Education has analyzed reports from a nationally stratified random sample of 936 school districts in 47 States. Of that sample, 459 districts (49%) were reviewed, 285 districts (30%) were not required to report, and 192 districts (20%) did not submit the required data. Of the 459 districts reviewed, 31% submitted data indicating comparability, 16% submitted data indicating non-comparability but with acceptable plans for corrective action, and 53% were found to be non-comparable. Of 5,566 Title I schools reviewed, 3,478 or 62% were comparable and 2,088 or 38% were non-comparable.

A plan for corrective action was classified as "non-acceptable" if it failed to provide information with respect to projected budgets, staff assignments, and other pertinent matters showing that comparability would be achieved. The range in degree of non-acceptability for such plans is thus quite broad. Of 34 States that submitted plans for 275 districts, only 72 plans (26%) were classified as acceptable. Many "plans" were merely justifications for non-comparability, or statements of intent to become comparable, or were predicated on future approval of school budgets.

Other findings refer to widespread deficiencies in the data themselves in such areas as completeness, computational accuracy, and conformity to comparability provisions. Of the 459 districts reviewed, 38% had significant data deficiencies.

The five criteria for comparability put into effect in 1971 were also reviewed. As a result, OE has proposed modification of the Title I Comparability regulations to combine the first three of those criteria into a single criterion: the ratio of pupils to instructional adults. The fourth criterion, instructional salaries less longevity pay, has been retained. The fifth criterion, other instructional costs, has been deleted; districts will be required, however, to file an assurance that the cost per pupil of all instructional material actually available in each school serving a project area is comparable to the cost of such materials available in other public schools with corresponding grade levels.

Revision of criteria should make those criteria more consistent and equitable. They would not affect the root problems of non-comparability of educational services, however; those problems remain unresolved and, indeed, become increasingly prominent as a basic issue in the ESEA Title I program.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

1. A Study of the Effects of Compensatory Reading Programs on the Development of Reading Skills in Elementary Schools

The current status of this study is as follows: (1) in Spring, 1972, the principals and teachers in a stratified nationally representative sample of 710 elementary schools were queried as to the nature and type of their compensatory reading programs and the students served; (2) from these results, some 250 schools were selected to participate in a detailed study of the effects of these programs on participant reading skills (using pre- and post-tests) during the 72-73 academic year (100 of these schools have compensatory reading programs funded by Title I, 100 have programs funded from some other source and 50 have no formal compensatory reading program).

2. Title I Management Analysis

This study began in July 1972 and will end on March 31, 1973. It is directed at three major areas of concern in Title I management: 1) the guidelines, which are guidance information from OE on the planning, implementation and evaluation of programs and projects; 2) information feedback, which is information to OE on program and project results and expenditures of funds; and 3) enforcement procedures, which are information and directives to regulate program and project operation and to keep programs and projects congruent with legislation, regulations and federal policy.

In Phase I of the study, the contractor described the "nominal" Title I management system, described the actual system as it operates, and synthesized a description of current structure and practices. In Phase II, the contractor is preparing detailed recommendations on guidelines, information feedback mechanisms, and enforcement procedures. There will also be specific recommendations on Title I program management at the national, state and local levels.

3. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Programs for Migratory Children of Migratory Agricultural Workers

Section 507 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318) directs the Commissioner of Education to conduct a study of the migrant education program under ESEA Title I. The study is to evaluate specific programs and projects in the migrant education program "with a view toward the assessment of their effectiveness," to evaluate State administration of those programs and projects, and to make recommendations for the improvement of such programs and projects.

The study is presently conceived in two phases. Phase I will fulfill the legislative mandate in December 1973, emphasizing the management assessment while necessarily limiting the impact evaluation to an analysis of existing data sources and a process evaluation of selected projects. Phase II, if implemented, will consist of a large-scale testing program involving a national sample of children served by the Title I migrant education program. The Phase II analysis, to be completed in the spring of 1975, will attempt to assess not only program impact but also the differential effects accruing from different educational experiences of migrant children.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Glass, G. V. Data analysis of the 1968-69 survey of compensatory education (Title I). Final Report. Boulder, Colo.: University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research, August 1970.

2. Hawkridge, D. G., Campeau, P. L., DeWitt, K. M., and Trickett, P. K. A study of further selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, June 1969. (ERIC No. ED 03668).

3. Hawkridge, D. G., Chalupsky, A. B., & Roberts, A. O. H. A study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children, Parts I and II. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, September 1968. (ERIC Nos. ED 023776 and ED 023777).

4. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/Office of Education. Education of the disadvantaged, An Evaluative report on Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, fiscal year 1968. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, April, 1970.

5. Wargo, M. J., Campeau, P. L. & Tallmadge, G. K. Further examinatio of exemplary programs for educating disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, July 1971. (ERIC No. ED 055128).

6. ESEA Title I: A Reanalysis and Synthesis of Evaluation Data from Fiscal Year 1965 through 1970, Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, March 1972. (ERIC No. ED 059415).

7. Wholey, J. S., White, B. F., Vogt, L. M., & Zamoff, R. B. Title I evaluation and technical assistance: Assessment and prospects. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute, October 1970. (ERIC No. ED 054259).

8. Wholey, J. S., White, B. F., Vogt, L. M., & Zamoff, R. B. Title I evaluation and technical assistance: Assessment and prospects. Appendices. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute, October 1970 (ERIC No. ED 054259).

9. Johns, R. L. Alexander, K. and Jordan, K. F. (Editors). Planning To Finance Education. Gainesville, Florida: National Education Finance Project. 1971.

10 USOE. Program statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education.

11 U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. The Effectiveness of Compensatory Education: Summary and Review of the Evidence, 1972.

12. U. S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards. The Process of Funds Allocation Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (An Interim Report), March 1972.

13. State evaluation reports on ESEA Title I, Fiscal Years 1971 and 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:
Supplementary Educational Centers and Services; Guidance, Counseling, and Testing

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, as amended	June 30, 1973

Funding History: Year	Authorization*	Appropriation
1966	$100,000,000	$75,000,000
1967	180,250,000	135,000,000
1968	515,000,000	187,876,000
1969	527,875,000	164,876,000
1970	566,500,000	116,393,000
1971	566,500,000	143,393,000
1972	592,250,000	146,393,000
1973	623,150,000	146,393,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title III provides funds to support local educational projects designed to: (1) stimulate and assist in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs and (2) assist the States in establishing and maintaining programs of guidance, counseling, and testing. Beginning with FY 71, the States were responsible for administering 85 percent of the Title III funds by awarding grants to local school districts. The Commissioner of Education has responsibility for administering the remaining 15 percent of the funds. These discretionary funds also support local school projects, with awards based on their potential contribution to the solution of critical educational problems common to all or several States. For purposes of Title III, an innovative project is an approach or program new to the area and designed to demonstrate a solution to a specific need. An exemplary project is one which has proven to be successful, is worthy of replication, and can serve as a model for other areas.

The underlying rationale for Title III has been attributed to the Task Force on Education, appointed by the President in the summer of 1964. The Task Force believed that substantial educational change had failed to take place not because of a scarcity of new ideas and programs, but because the efforts to innovate and the mechanisms to disseminate innovative ideas had been on a scale far below the actual need. Title III, through its direct support for innovation, was intended to help meet that need.

---

*An amount equal to 3 percent of funds appropriated is authorized for allotment to outlying areas, to schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and to overseas dependent schools operated by the Department of Defense.

Each State qualifies for funding under the State Plan portion of Title III by submitting an annual State Plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for approval. Funds are then allocated to the States on the basis of a population proportional formula. The restrictions on the use of Title III State-administered funds are: (1) 15 percent must be used for projects for the handicapped, and (2) expenditures for guidance, counseling, and testing purposes must be an amount equal to at least 50 percent of the amount expended by each State from funds appropriated for fiscal year 1970 for Title V-A of the National Defense Education Act.

The Federal-State cooperative approach in program operations is exemplified by the Identification, Validation and Dissemination (IVD) process. Currently, the 57 State educational agencies which participate in the Title III program are working together to identify educational practices and conditions which make significant differences in the educational achievement of children at a reasonable cost. This IVD process utilizes four criteria to verify the success of Title III projects: (1) innovative (2) successful (3) exportable and (4) economical. Validated practices will become part of a pool of exemplary practices for dissemination to school districts throughout the Nation.

In fiscal year 1971 a total of 8.1 million students were direct participants in Title III State grant programs, involving face-to-face interaction of pupils and teachers designed to produce learning in a classroom or center, or receiving other special services. An additional 16 million children were indirect participants, visiting exhibits or demonstrations, using Title III materials or equipment, receiving television instruction, or participating in similar activities.

The following table shows the amount of Title III State grant funds and the number of direct participants in local projects in fiscal year 1971 (since some projects have multiple components, the number of participants may not be, in some cases, mutually exclusive).

Major Program Component	Number of Direct Participants, FY 71	Title III funds, FY 71 (in thousands)
Reading	522,000	$10,341
Environmental Education	471,500	3,093
Equal Educational Opportunity	125,000	5,080
Model Cities	100,000	5,421
Programs for the Gifted	17,839	1,634
Handicapped	180,000	19,015
Guidance, Counseling and Testing	1,346,000	6,876
Drug Education	26,100	668
Early Childhood	54,000	5,350
Other	5,258,000	45,616
	8,100,439	$103,094

Source: Annual State Reports.

Included in the number of participants were 23,960 Indian children and 9,641 children of migrants.

In FY 72 funds from the discretionary portion of Title III supported 117 continuing or new projects designed to demonstrate kindergarten reading programs, to exploit new uses of educational technology for improvement of instruction, to fund model reading programs in the Right to Read effort, to support a four-site program in use of incentives to parents and teachers who succeed in improving the basic skill achievement of disadvantaged children, and to support projects involving artists in the schools.

Program Effectiveness:

Although there has been no comprehensive, in-depth evaluation of the effectiveness of Title III, several surveys and reviews of the program have sought to determine effectiveness of Title III in terms of the degree of innovativeness, the extent to which projects are continued after the usual 3-year period of federal funding and the extent to which projects are replicated. Since the methodology used in these studies is diverse and the findings sometimes contradictory, no attempt will be made to summarize the results. Rather, the highlights of individual studies are reported below.

From the first studies to the most recent, strong emphasis on innovation has been stressed. The first studies (references 1 and 2) expressed concern that the program would emphasize services rather than innovation. In another study based on site visits to 60 projects in 1968, Benson and Guthrie judged two-thirds of the projects visited to be outstanding successes (reference 3). They found Title III to have been particularly effective in supporting experimentation with new instructional models and curricula formats, the development and adoption of useful new educational technology, and the establishment of exemplary special education programs. The President's National Advisory Council, in its second report covering fiscal year 1969, (reference 7) reported that the original emphasis on innovative and creative programs was losing ground, and called on the education community to re-examine its commitment to innovation and change. In later reviews (see references 8 and 9) the Council found the record more encouraging on the basis of its reviews of selected projects. It found need, however, for emphasizing innovation and reform and recommended that the program title be changed to "Educational Innovation and Reform."

Project continuation beyond the period of Federal funding as one measure of success has been the subject of several studies. One of these, by Anthony John Polemeni (reference 4) dealt with projects in operation prior to January 1968. Questionnaires to project directors provided information on 149 projects and found: 120 projects discontinued after Title III funds were terminated; 5 projects continued for a brief time but then discontinued; 24 still in operation in fiscal year 1969. The relatively low level of continuation was reported to be due largely to "inability to absorb the costs." Polemeni concluded, however, that a 16 percent continuation rate for projects supported by "risk money" was not a discouraging rate of return.

Another study was based on questionnaires sent to school district superintendents four years after initation of Title III projects. (reference 5). It was reported that 84 percent of the projects were continued in some form after the period of Federal funding. The superintendents also reported that:

1) The average project was responsible for stimulating 20 similar new programs in other schools.

2) Continued projects, in comparison to discontinued projects, served larger numbers of pupils; had larger budgets for training, evaluation, and dissemination; had greater school board and community involvement in their development; and included activities that were major additions to or reorganizations of the school or curriculum.

A 1971 study by the Presidents Advisory Council (see reference 9) reported continuation rates based on responses to questionnaires of school superintendents in 788 districts which had received Title III funds for 3-year operational grants in 1966, 1967, and 1968. It was reported that 67 percent of the projects continued beyond the period of Federal funding, and that 53 percent of them were still in existence in October 1971.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Quantitative data on Title III projects will continue to be collected and analyzed annually through the Consolidated Program Information Report. Other descriptive data will be provided through reports from the National Advisory Council. Title III programs will be studied in conjunction with an assessment of demonstration types of programs beginning in fiscal year 1973.

1. *Catalyst for Change: A National Study of ESEA Title III (PACE).* University of Kentucky, 1967.
2. *PACE: Catalyst for Change,* The Second National Study of PACE. University of Kentucky, 1968.
3. Benson, C. S. and Guthrie, J. W. *An Essay on Federal Incentives and Local and State Educational Initiative. University of California, Berkeley: December, 1968.*
4. Polemeni, Anthony J. *A Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 83-531 (89-10)), After the Approved Funding Periods.* April, 1969.
5. Hearn, Norman. *Innovative Educational Programs: A Study of the Influence of Selected Variables Upon Their Continuation Following the Termination of Three Year Title III Grants.* 1969.
6. President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. *PACE: Transition of a Concept,* First Annual Report. 1969.
7. _______________. *The Rocky Road Called Innovation,* Second Annual Report, 1970.
8. _______________. *Educational Reform Through Innovation,* Third Annual Report, 1971.
9. _______________. *Time for a Progress Report,* Fourth Annual Report, 1972.
10. Consolidated Program Information Reports (Office of Education reporting form for program data).
11. Annual State Reports, ESEA Title III.
12. *Elementary School Survey, 1969-70.*

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening State Departments of Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
ESEA Title V, Part A	June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$25,000,000	$17,000,000
1967	30,000,000	22,000,000
1968	65,000,000	29,750,000*
1969	80,000,000	29,750,000
1970	80,000,000	29,750,000
1971	80,000,000	29,750,000
1972	85,000,000	33,000,000
1973	90,000,000	33,000,000

---

* Beginning in 1968, includes $7,750,000 formerly included in separate appropriations for the National Defense Education Act.

Program Purpose and Operation:

ESEA Title V, Part A, authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their education agencies and to assist these agencies in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet their educational needs. The grants are made to each SEA on the basis of project applications. OE approval of these State applications is required, following a determination that they conform to the broad purposes of Title V.

Ninety-five percent of the Title V, Part A, appropriation is available to State educational agencies as basic grants. Of this amount, two percent is set aside for distribution to the outlying areas on the basis of need as determined by the Commissioner of Education. The remainder is distributed to the 50 States and the District of Columbia by a formula which divides 40 percent of the amount equally and 60 percent on the basis of the number of public school pupils in each State.

The remaining five percent of the appropriation is reserved for special project grants to State education agencies to enable groups of these agencies to develop their leadership capabilities through experimental projects and to solve high priority common problems.

States are directing almost half of Title V, Part A, appropriations towards strengthening services provided for local education agencies, such as identification and dissemination of successful practices, planning and installing up-to-date curricula in the schools, improving evaluating strategies, and improvement of administration. About half the remaining funds are used for general administration costs of the State agencies, with the remainder supporting program planning, development, and evaluation, and other activities of the State Agencies.

In FY 1972 the States used their basic grant funds by object of expenditure in the following manner:

	% of total
Salaries	71.3
Contracted services	4.7
Equipment	4.2
Other expenditures*	19.8

Source: State Annual Reports
*Other expenditures include staff travel; fixed charges (rent, insurance); supplies, materials, printing, and other expenses.

Special projects grants have been used by SEAs for such purposes as development of models for financing education, systems to modernize educational management practices, and a plan for interstate certification of teachers. More than 60 interstate projects of varying duration and scope have been funded under this program.

OE strategy is based upon providing technical assistance to State educational agencies to strengthen their capabilities to bring about desirable changes and improvements in State educational systems.

Reviews of State educational agency management have been conducted by OE, providing each State with an in-depth analysis and evaluation of its management techniques. Approximately 75 percent of the recommendations from these reviews have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented.

No formal evaluation of the effectiveness of Title V in achieving its legislative goals has been completed. State Management Reviews have been conducted in all States and provide a base for future comparison of changes in management functions, as successive Reviews are accomplished. Program information based on State plans, fiscal reports, and Management Reviews is provided in annual reports, previously by the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education and, beginning with fiscal year 1970, by the Office of Education.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Center for Educational Policy Research at Harvard University is conducting an in-depth study of three States to analyze the uses and effectiveness of Title V grant money.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard University, Title V of ESEA, Decentralization and Responsive Government, Interim Report.
2. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, The Federal-State Partnership for Education, May 1972.
3. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, The State of State Departments of Education, March, 1969.
4. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, Focus on The Future, March 1968.
5. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, Reinforcing the Role of the State in Education, March 1967.
6. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, Improving State Leadership in Education, March 1966.
7. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, State Departments of Education and Federal Programs, 1972.
8. Annual State Reports, ESEA V.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Bilingual Education

Legislation:

Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, ESEA)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:	Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
	FY 68	$ 15,000,000	$ 0
	FY 69	30,000,000	7,500,000
	FY 70	40,000,000	21,000,000
	FY 71	80,000,000	25,000,000
	FY 72	100,000,000	34,902,000
	FY 73	135,000,000	35,080,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Bilingual Education Program is designed to meet the special educational needs of children who have limited English-speaking ability, who come from environments where the dominant language is not English, and who come from low-income families. There are an estimated five million children in the United States who need bilingual education. Some of these children know little or no English when they enter school; however, many of them are fluent in their home language. In addition, the cultural heritage and life style of many is different than that of "mainstream America". Hence, a special program building upon their differences and strengths is needed, which teaches subject matter in the home language and which also respects the life style and heritage of the children.

In FY 72 there were 217 projects serving 106,000 children. These projects together served 24 different language groups. Eighty percent of the projects served Spanish-speaking groups only, 8% served Native Americans (Indians and Eskimos) and the remaining 12% of the projects served other language groups such as Portuguese, French, Chinese, Russian or served combinations of language groups together such as Spanish and Russian groups, or Spanish, Ute and Navajo groups. These bilingual projects are funded with discretionary grants given (1) to a local educational agency or group of such agencies or (2) to a local educational agency or agencies jointly with an institution of higher learning.

Title VII was intended by OE to be, at least initially, a demonstration program. That is, Bilingual funds were to be used to set up projects which could serve as models and which could be disseminated to interested schools using local, State or other Federal (for example, Title I) funds. The USOE is facilitating this endeavor in a number of ways. For example, USOE is working with State Education Agencies in the development of State-wide strategies for bilingual programs. It is intended that the States will be able to offer technical assistance to all bilingual programs in their jurisdiction. In addition, the Bilingual Program is continuing to support certain special projects; these include projects to develop, collect, and disseminate materials in a variety of languages, to develop tests appropriate for bilingual children, to work out methods for training teachers and teacher aides to meet the growing demand for bilingual instructors, and to fund the development of TV programs for Nationwide viewing for Spanish-speaking children.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

It is appropriate to judge the effectiveness of Title VII in two areas: (1) to judge its effectiveness as an agent of change and (2) to judge its effectiveness in improving the attitudes and learning of children. The evidence of effectiveness in these two areas will be expanded upon in the following paragraphs. However, in summary it may be said that (1) viewed as an agent for change, the Bilingual Education Program appears to be effective but that (2) we do not know whether or not the program has had a positive impact on the attitudes and learning of children, nor do we know which particular approaches to bilingual education are most effective.

A tremendous interest in bilingual education has developed since the enactment of Title VII. The federal program, because it was an early effort to give visibility to this approach, is credited as a factor in evoking this interest. Because of heightened awareness of and interest in bilingual/bicultural education, the special needs of children whose dominant language is not English are increasingly being addressed by new legislation, programs and money. Some examples follow:

1) Ten states have passed legislation permitting a language other than English to be used as a medium of instruction in the classroom. In most cases prior to 1969 these states had laws expressly prohibiting such use.

2) Massachusetts and the Virgin Islands passed legislation in 1972 making bilingual education manditory whenever there are specific concentrations of children of limited English-speaking ability. Four other states have similar legislation pending or to be presented to the 1973 State legislations.

3) Four states have passed legislation authorizing funds for the development of bilingual education. Another nine states have budget line items marked for bilingual education, even though there is no State legislation.

4) There has been an increased demand for teachers trained for bilingual classes. Colleges and universities are beginning to change their offerings to better prepare persons planning to work in bilingual education programs.

Other changes which Title VII is more directly responsible for have occurred in the education system, making it more responsive to the needs of non-English-speaking children. For example, at least 187 schools not served by Title VII have used local, State, other Federal funds, or combinations of these to replicate bilingual programs in one or more grades.

Besides being evaluated on its effectiveness as a change agent, Title VII should also be evaluated on its effectiveness in producing positive changes in children in the cognitive, affective and behavioral areas. Currently, the only source of data concerning program effectiveness are the individual project evaluation reports submitted yearly. A sample of these reports was examined; however, limitations in the methodologies or the data prevented them from being used to draw conclusions about overall program effectiveness. (A future source of data on the Bilingual Education Program will be a process evaluation now in progress).

These findings should not be construed to mean that the bilingual program is not effective, but rather that because of the nature and quality of the local evaluation reports, they cannot be used to assess overall program effectiveness. Thus, at this time we have no "hard" data on overall program success either in the cognitive or affective domains. We do have impressionistic evidence that individual projects have been successful, especially in the affective area.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A process evaluation of the Bilingual Program is being carried out during the 1972-73 school year; a report will be available in the Fall of 1973. This evaluation will describe the approaches used in a random sample of bilingual projects and will, in addition, describe the degree to which these approaches adhere to the program Guidelines. It will also look at the function and degree of utilization of the special projects dealing with material acquisition and dissemination, test development, etc. This process evaluation will lay the groundwork for a future evaluation which will deal with the effectiveness of bilingual education as measured by impact upon the children.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Individual Project Evaluation Reports.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Follow Through

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P.L. 90-222(a)(2))	June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Appropriation
	1968	$15,000,000
	1969	32,000,000
	1970	70,300,000
	1971	69,000,000
	1972	63,030,000
	1973	57,700,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Follow Through is an experimental program designed to investigate a variety of approaches to reinforce gains made in Headstart or similar pre-school programs by children from impoverished families. Provisions are also made for assessing abilities and gains of such children who have not had pre-school experiences. Twenty-two different models of Follow Through are being tried, most at several sites. Each model is designed, implemented, and monitored by a sponsoring group.

The U. S. Office of Education funds local projects that are nominated by the State Education Agency and the State Economic Opportunity Office in accordance with USOE and OEO criteria. Up to 20% of the appropriation may be awarded at the discretion of USOE. The other 80% is allotted to the States in accordance with a formula established in the legislation.

Currently, there are approximately 150,000 children from impoverished families who have attended pre-school. Approximately 4 million such children are enrolled in kindergarten through third grade. This is the population which might ultimately be affected by the findings which are expected to emerge from the Follow Through experiment.

An experiment has been set up to provide for comparison of the various sponsor models. A national evaluation designed by USOE is the primary means by which such comparisons will be made although evaluations by school districts and sponsors will also have a bearing on the final conclusions.

Program Effectiveness:

The national evaluation is designed primarily to identify which approaches are successful in producing educationally significant gains in cognitive achievement, in positive attitudes towards schooling, and in parental ability to share in determining the nature of their children's education. The national evaluation is longitudinal and involves four cohorts of children. In general, children are tested as they enter school (either kindergarten or first grade) and when they leave the program at the end of the third grade. The following chart shows the progression of children involved in the evaluation through the grades by cohort and by school year. There are 173 local projects in the program but not all are involved in the national evaluation.

School Year

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Cohort 1	K	1	2	3			
	1	2	3				
Cohort 2		K	1	2	3		
		1	2	3			
Cohort 3			K	1	2	3	
			1	2	3		
Cohort 4				K	1	2	3
				1	2	3	

Thousands of children and parents have been tested and interviewed as the children enter the program, when they leave the program and at some intermediate points. As can be seen in the foregoing chart, only a few children have graduated from the program to date; therefore, findings are based on preliminary data primarily from testing at intermediate test points. Although the entire evaluation will not be completed until FY 78, the following interim results give some indication of the program's impact.

The best cohort for sponsor comparisons is cohort III which completed the first year of Follow Through in the spring of 1972. The only data presently available for this group are raw scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Since these scores have not yet been adjusted for differences between the groups being compared, they can be interpreted only as strongly suggestive. The conclusion which the data from the Metropolitan Achievement Test suggest is that the highly structured programs are showing the greatest effects, both in comparison with their non-Follow Through comparison groups and in comparison with the other sponsors. However, we are looking at only an achievement measure and only short term effects. This finding is in accordance with preliminary results from the first two cohorts and fits with expectations based on the goals of the sponsors -- that those which emphasize academic achievement will show the greatest short term effects on achievement. It is not appropriate to use the data to draw conclusions about sponsors which do not emphasize achievement in the same way for two reasons. First, domains which they emphasize are not tapped by the instrument and second, the end of the first year is not the time at which those sponsors expect to show achievement gains.

Additionally, communities have demonstrated signs of positive acceptance and regard for Follow Through programs. Surveys of both parents and teachers support this interpretation. Follow Through parents report a higher degree of involvement in school and community affairs than do non-Follow Through parents. In addition, Follow Through teachers indicate satisfaction with the alternate methods offered by Follow Through. Findings are mixed with regard to how important teachers view the parents' role in the education of the child. For the most part, the above findings of positive parent and teachers effects are relatively stable across the first two cohorts.

Once again, none of the statements above is conclusive. Stronger evidence on the effects of Follow Through will be forthcoming over the next few years as more cohorts of children complete the program and data are analyzed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies

The Stanford Research Institute is under contract to USOE through the spring of 1973 to do the data collection and data processing for the national evaluation of Follow Through. A competitive procurement will determine the contractor for this activity after this spring. Abt Associates in Cambridge, Massachusetts performs the analysis of the data.

Sources of Evaluation Data

1. Emrick, J. A., Sorensen, P. H., and Stearns, M. S. Interim Evaluation of the National Follow Through Program 1969-1971. Menlo Park, Calif: Stanford Research Institute, February 1973.
2. Local Project Evaluation Reports
3. Sponsor Evaluations

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA) - Maintenance and Operation

Legislation:

P. L. 81-874

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 359,450,000	$332,000,000
1966	388,000,000	388,000,000
1967	433,400,000	416,200,000
1968	461,500,000	416,200,000
1969	560,950,000	505,900,000
1970	650,594,000	505,400,000
1971	935,295,000	536,068,000
1972	1,024,000,000	592,580,000
1973	1,065,600,000	568,752,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

P. L. 81-874 provides financial aid for maintenance and operation to school districts which have been affected by the existence of Federal installations in these areas. The purpose of the legislation is to minimize the fiscal inequities caused by both the presence of tax-exempt Federal lands and the burden of providing public school education to school children who reside on federal property and parent is employed on federal property. Payments are made directly to the LEAs and are based on local education costs and on the number of children whose parents live on United States government property or work for the United States government (designated B pupils), or who do both (designated as A pupils), or with a parent in the uniformed services (also designated B pupils).

Also under this law, assistance may be provided to a school district located in a major disaster area as proclaimed by the President. Such assistance may be: (1) for repair or replacement of equipment, materials, and supplies; minor repairs to facilities, and provision of temporary facilities, and (2) to support the level of education within the school district that was maintaining prior to the disaster. Assistance is provided upon application.

---

*Provisions pertaining to A pupils and children attending schools on Federal installations are permanent.

P.L. 874 is the closest approximation of general aid from the Federal Government available to eligible school districts. Funds received under P. L. 81-874 usually are deposited in the school district's general operating fund and expended in accordance with State law and practice. The number of school children counted for aid purposes in 1972 was 2,425,000, the total number of children attending schools in these eligible LEAs amounted to 24,000,000. Since the funds are deposited in the general operating account some or all of these children could conceivable benefit from the SAFA aid. In calculating entitlements, school districts are reimbursed for the local cost of A pupils and for half of the local cost for B pupils.

Program Effectiveness:

The SAFA program is not designed to produce measurable outcomes in school children. However, in the implementation of this legislation various anomalies have appeared. These have been amply documented in an extensive study conducted by the Battelle Memorial Institute under the direction of the U. S. Office of Education. The study concludes that certain school districts are being over-compensated for the real or presumed burden of Federal activity as a result of one or more of the following situations:

1. Payments that far exceed the cost to the local government of educating Federal pupils.
2. Payments to wealthy school districts which could finance better-than-average school costs even without SAFA aid.
3. Payments to districts where the economic activity occurring on non-taxable Federal lands (e.g., a leased oil well or an aircraft company on Federal property) generates enough local taxes to support increased school costs.
4. Payments to school districts which are compensated twice for the same government impact under different Federal legislation. For example, some districts benefit from shared revenues, such as timber and Taylor grazing revenues from public lands and are entitled to impact aid under P.L. 81-874. "Because impact aid is based upon the student population rather than property characteristics, the two payments frequently overlap to the benefit of the school district."
5. Some overcompensation to school districts since States are prevented from considering SAFA aid payments in calculating State aid. Districts which are entitled

to impact aid benefit from those State aid formulas which attempt equalization. In some SAFA districts, the presence of Federal land reduces the per pupil assessed valuation causing State aid payments to rise.

6. Higher per pupil payments to rich districts than to poor ones resulting from the inclusion of local expenditure in calculating the aid formula.

7. Children are counted who would be attending school in a district even if the Federal Government had never come into the area. As an example, Battelle cites the case of farmers who take employment at an airbase and still maintain their farm residences in neighboring school districts which may now qualify for SAFA aid.

8. Payments that often do not reflect the economic stimulus that the Federal Government may cause in a community.

In a few instances, school districts are underpaid under the present law. For example, in one school district, government-owned house trailers were parked on private property near an airbase. In this instance, neither the airbase nor the trailers were subject to taxation and the school district was only able to impose property taxes on the relatively poor land on which the trailers were parked. In determining its entitlement, the school district was paid on the basis of B pupils because their residence was on private taxable property.

As a result of these observations, Battelle proposed specific changes in the legislative formula. Payments should be reduced to school districts for the so-called B students, (i.e., those students whose parents work on Federal property but live on private property) by modifications to the existing law:

(1) Absorption - Paying only for those students in a school district that exceed the Federal impact on all districts. This average impact for Federal activity was estimated at 3% of all students for the country as a whole. Under the present law, when the number of eligible students in any LEA exceed 3% of the average daily attendance by even one student, then all of the eligible are counted for impacted aid purposes.

(2) Change in rate of payment - Changing the payment rate for B pupils from the current level of 50% of the A students, i.e., those whose parents live and work on Federal property, to 40% of the A students. The rationale offered for this change is that school districts are presumed only to lose an estimated 40% of property tax revenues normally paid by business, which, for the parents of B students, is the untaxable Federal property where they work.

(3) Richness cutoffs - Reducing or eliminating districts that have an average tax base that is 25% above State average per pupil tax base. The present law has no such cut-off.

Battelle also suggested that the local tax effort be taken into account in devising any formula changes; that Federal in-lieu-of-tax payments, shared revenues and other special payments be deducted from impact aid payments; and that the capital cost program (P. L. 815) be merged with the operating cost program (P.L. 874).

Major Disaster Assistance Obligations and Expenditures to date are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Obligated	Expended
1966	$3,936,146	$3,936,146
1967	790,411	790,411
1968	3,274,628	3,274,628
1969	2,615,130	2,615,130
1970	5,197,178	5,153,263
1971	11,577,391	10,288,894
1972	37,617,736	25,577,119
Total	$65,008,620	$51,635,591

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Battelle Memorial Institute, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, published by Committee on Education and Labor, H.R., 91st Congress, 2nd Session, G.P.O., 1970.

2. Administration of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, G.P.O., 1970.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA): Construction

Legislation:

P.L. 81-815

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$58,400,000	$58,400,000
1966	50,078,000	50,078,000
1967	58,000,000	52,937,000
1968	80,620,000	22,937,000
1969	79,162,000	14,745,000
1970	80,407,000	15,181,000
1971	83,000,000	15,000,000
1972	91,250,000	20,040,000
1973	72,000,000	15,910,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

P. L. 81-815 is designed to provide local education agencies with financial aid for school construction under specified conditions. P. L. 81-815 authorizes financial assistance to eligible LEAs for construction of urgently needed minimum school facilities in school districts which have had substantial increases in school membership as a result of new or increased Federal activities (Section 5). Financial assistance is also available to a school district for the construction of temporary school facilities where the Federal impact is expected to be temporary (Section 9). The law also allows the Commissioner to make arrangements for providing minimum school facilities for federally-connected children if no tax revenues of the state or its political subdivisions may be spent for their education or if the Commissioner finds that no local education agency is able to provide a suitable free public education (Section 10). Assistance is authorized for construction of minimum school facilities in local education agencies serving children residing on Indian lands--(Subsections 14(a) and (b)). Under subsection 14(c) assistance is authorized also to financially distressed local education agencies which have substantial Federal lands and substantial numbers of unhoused pupils.

Emergency aid is available to LEAs for the reconstruction of school facilities destroyed or seriously damaged in school districts located in declared major disaster areas (Section 16).

---

*Provisions pertaining to section 5(a)(1) pupils, sections 10 and 14 are permanent.

Since FY 1967, Federal funds appropriated for P.L. 81-815 have been substantially below the amounts required for funding of all qualified applicants under the Act. OE has utilized a system of priorities required by the law to determine the applications to be funded. Each section of the law has a priority ranking and within each section the priority of an application is based on the number of children eligible for payment and the estimated number who are "unhoused." The "unhoused" are defined as the number above the normal capacity of the minimum school facilities.

All grants are made to qualified school districts on the basis of applications. The amount of payment to the LEA varies according to the section under which an applicant applies. Under Section 5, payment varies between 45% and 95% of actual per pupil construction costs depending on whether eligibility stemmed from "A" or "B" pupils.* Sections 9 and 10 provide for total payment of school construction costs for those pupils who are eligible to be counted for payment and who are also unhoused. Federal grants to provide needed minimum school facilities for children residing on Indian lands vary from 100 percent under subsection 14(b) to the difference between available State and local funds and the total project cost under subsection 14(a). Section 16 also requires that the Federal share be a residual payment after all other sources of aid have been utilized.

Program Effectiveness:

An evaluation of P.L. 81-815 was contained in the study by the Battelle Memorial Institute. The study concluded that with its systems of project by project approval the administration of P.L. 815 is unnecessarily complicated. Furthermore, "because capital projects are easily deferrable in the Federal budget, P.L. 815 provides for uncertain levels of support based upon a priority system that tends to penalize a district that proceeds on its own to provide classrooms for Federally connected students."

Under P. L. 815, an eligible district which applies for Federal funds must show an increase in school membership over a 4-year period prior to receiving a project approval. In periods of partial funding (as in the present), the Act specifies which sections shall be funded first from any appropriation.

---

* See School Assistance for Federally Affected Areas Maintenance and Operations, for an explanation of "A" and "B" pupils.

Due to limited appropriations a backlog of unfunded applications has been created under all sections, except Section 16.

As presently worded, P. L. 81-815 makes no provision for the depreciation of schools built with Federal funds. The law is concerned with increases in Federally connected children. Should the number of Federally connected children become stable in the long run and should facilites initially provided under P. L. 81-815 become obsolete, then replacement costs would have to be borne solely by the school district.

In its study of SAFA, Battelle recommended that the capital cost program (P.L. 815) applicable to the usual situations be merged with the operating cost program (P.L. 874) in order to simplify its administration.

Beginning in FY 1966 when major disaster assistance was authorized approximately $22 million has been obligated to reconstruct facilities destroyed or seriously damaged by hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, and floods. About 70 percent of that assistance was approved in the past two fiscal years.

Since 1966, the number of classrooms provided and pupils housed is as follows: (Note: These figures do not correspond to Fiscal Year appropriations.

Section & fiscal year	Classrooms provided	Pupils housed
Sections 5, 8, 9		
1972	0	0
1971	58	220
1970	7,901	201,770
1969	2,416	98,390
1968	903	27,218
1967	1,100	33,355
1966	1,630	47,405

Section and fiscal year	Classrooms provided	Pupils housed
Section 14		
1972	5	100
1971	73	1,710
1970	11	332
1969	21	566
1968	21	690
1967	16	435
1966	87	2,600
Section 10		
1972	0	0
1971	161	4,151
1970	37	746
1969	137	3,704
1968	38	813
1967	100	2,440
1966	191	5,486
Section 16		
1972	146	3,890
1971	71	1,760
1970	40	1,155
1969	22	590
1968	21	590
1967	9	270
1966	0	0

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Battelle Memorial Institute, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, published by the Committee on Education and Labor, H.R. 91st Congress, 2nd Session, GPO, 1970.

2. Administration of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Public Law 91-380	June 30, 1971
Continuing Resolution 92-38	February 22, 1972
Public Law 92-607	June 30, 1973

President Nixon proposed the $1.5 billion Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 on May 21, 1970, to meet special needs of desegregating school districts. Pending Congressional approval of that Act, on August 18, 1970 Congress appropriated $75 million, as a short term emergency measure to meet such needs, and thus established ESAP. The ESAP appropriation was based on six legislative authorities:

(1) The Education Professions Development Act, Part D.
(2) The Cooperative Research Act.
(3) The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV.
(4) The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 807.
(5) The Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, Section 402.
(6) The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Title II.

While Congressional approval of the Emergency School Aid Act was still pending the ESAP program was extended by Continuing Resolution to assist local education agencies and community groups for the 1971-72 school year and part of the 1972-73 school year.

Funding History:	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
	1971	$75,000,000
	1972	$75,000,000
	1973	$21,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The general purpose of the ESAP program was stated in the ESAP regulations to be to:

> Meet special needs . . . incident to the elimination of racial segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools by contributing to the costs of new or expanded activities . . . designed to achieve successful desegregation and the elimination of all forms of discrimination in the schools on the basis of students or faculty being members of a minority group.

ESAP Assistance was used to support a range of LEA operational costs. To achieve the program's purpose and objectives there were five activities to help with problems relating to desegregation funded under this appropriation. These were: (1) special community programs; (2) special pupil personnel services; (3) special curriculum revision programs and teacher preparation programs; (4) special student to student activities; and (5) special comprehensive planning.

Regional HEW personnel were responsible for pre- and post grant review of grant application and grantee activities. Regional OE personnel reviewed the program content of applications, and monitored the program operations, providing technical assistance where needed. Regional personnel for the Office for Civil Rights were responsible for determinations of eligibility of applicants, and monitoring of a grantee's compliance with the civil-rights related assurances which were contained in the grant application as required by the ESAP regulations. Both OE and OCR monitoring were achieved by means of reports required of grantees and by site visits performed by staff members. Where OE or OCR review indicates noncompliance with ESAP regulations efforts were first made to achieve voluntary compliance. Where voluntary compliance was not possible the information was referred to the Office of the General Counsel for termination action.

During the period of August to November 1970, 900 ESAP-I grants were made to Local Education Agencies for a total of $63,325,000. During the period of August to November 1971, 452 grants were made to LEAs for a total of $63,975,398. During the period July 1 to August 17, 1972, 395 grants were made to LEAs for a total of $17,523,000.

Under ESAP-I, a school district was eligible for financial assistance if (1) it was desegregating its schools under a final State or Federal court order or under a voluntary plan approved by HEW as meeting the nondiscrimination requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and (2) it commenced the terminal phase of such plan or court order by the opening of the 1970-71 academic year or had commenced such terminal phase during the 1968-69 or 1969-70 academic year. The regulations defined terminal phase as that phase of a desegregation plan at which the school district begins operating a unitary school system--one within which no person is effectively excluded from any school because of race or color.

Three priority groups were established for funding under ESAP-II. Priority I districts were those required to take new or additional steps respecting desegregation pursuant to a court order or order under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 issued or modified on or after April 20, 1971 (the date of the United States Supreme

Court decision in the case of Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education). Priority II districts were those required to take new or additional steps in 1971-72 although the Title VI plan or court order was issued prior to April 20, 1971. Priority III districts were those which received ESAP grants prior to July 1, 1971 (i.e., ESAP-I grantees).

The amended regulations for continuation of ESAP II in the 1972-73 school year restricted eligibility to those grantees, either local education agencies or community groups, which had received grants during June 1971 under ESAP I or under the ESAP II program. The purpose of these regulations was to provide grantees with continued funding until they were able to apply for funds under the Emergency School Aid Act. Expenditure categories under ESAP II continuation activities were limited to salaries of personnel and minor related expenses.

Program Effectiveness of ESAP-I School District Grants

A detailed study of ESAP-I school district grants was conducted under contract to OE by Resource Management Corporation, Inc. RMC randomly selected 252 ESAP-I districts in fourteen southern States for a detailed analysis and evaluation. These districts enroll 51 percent of the minority students in districts funded by the ESAP program and 28 percent of all minority students in the fourteen States.

Program statistics show that in all ESAP-I districts 2,260,000 students were reassigned to desegregated schools out of 7,170,000 total students enrolled. The RMC results show that the amount of racial change from the 1969-70 to the 1970-71 school years in individual schools receiving ESAP services varied widely:

Amount of racial change	Estimated Percent of all ESAP schools
More integrated	
Substantial change (More than 5 percentage points)	46
Small change (5 percentage points or less)	15
No change	27
Became more segregated	13

In March-April 1971, over 9,000 ESAP Project Directors, principals, teachers and students in 879 schools were interviewed about changes in the racial climate in their schools since the school year began in Fall 1970. Student responses to a large number of questions suggest that school desegregation during the 1970-71 school year was not as turbulent as frequently portrayed. Fully 41 percent of students attending desegregated schools for the first time reported changes for the better during the year as far as "going to school with students of another race." Most of the remainder had not changed their views and less than 5 percent felt worse. Eighty percent of all students interviewed agree that "students are cooperating more and more as the year goes on." While a minority of the students still felt somewhat ambivalent about their school, 80 percent of both races reported learning more in school than the previous year.

ESAP Project Directors, principals and teachers were asked about 12 specific areas of possible change in the school racial climate since the start of the school year, including those listed in the table below:

	Percent of Teachers Perceiving Situation as:			
Area of Possible Change	Better	No change	Worse	Total
(1) Number of interracial friendships	63	36	1	100%
(2) Students of different races working together in the classrooms	51	47		100%
(3) Teachers of different races relate to each other	34	63	3	100%
(4) Student groupings on the campus and cafeteria	32	66	2	100%
(5) Attendance of black students	19	75		100%

Perhaps the most significant finding is that the vast majority of respondents found that the racial climate had changed for the better or had not changed. On most items, only 1 to 3 percent of the teachers felt that the situation had worsened during the year. Principals were significantly more positive than teachers (their "percent better" responses on the above items are 78, 64, 51, 38, and 33 respectively).

Did ESAP contribute to improvements in the racial climate of schools? The relationship between the presence of various ESAP activities in the 879 schools visited and positive changes in the five measures of racial climate was examined. The presence of certain ESAP activities was significantly associated with positive racial change. Schools with ESAP counselors, for example, showed more positive racial change than schools that did not have ESAP counselors. Based on this and other statistical analyses, RMC concluded that the following ESAP activities are effective:

(1) Counseling
(2) Counseling support
(3) Student programs
(4) Remedial programs

The analyses also show that teacher training activities were not effective. Racial climate measures showed more improvement in schools that did not have ESAP teacher training than in schools that did. Yet, teacher training was one of the most frequent activities chosen and was well above average in cost, totally about 12 percent of ESAP-I funds.

A large portion of funds also were expended in twelve other categories of activities that could not be shown to be effective or ineffective. These categories were: personal community activities, non-personal community activities, ethnic classes and materials, non-ethnic classes and materials, teacher aides and other support personnel, busing, remedial education personnel, comprehensive planning, administrative personnel, materials, facilities improvement, and all others. However the possible value of teacher training and these neutral categories of activities cannot be stated in terms of academic achievement since no achievement measures were collected in this study.

An overall assessment of ESAP is difficult to make from this study because no control schools were visited to determine what changes would have occurred in the schools if they had not had the impact of ESAP funds. Although ESAP was rarely cited by respondents who were asked to cite the reasons for improvements in racial climate in their schools, the expected impact of ESAP on outcomes was really an open question because of the short time its activities had been in effect when the study was done and because of the small amount of funds provided relative to the school districts' total budgets.

In addition to the RMC report, other reports reviewed the policies of DHEW in administering ESAP-I. A report sponsored by the Washington Research Project for an evaluation of 300 ESAP-I grantees in December, 1970, concluded that many project grants were going toward the support of activities not connected with desegregation efforts and to districts which were still practicing racial discrimination.

The General Accounting Office (GAO), after reviewing the grant approval procedures of DHEW and examining expenditures in a sample of districts, reported in March, 1971, that HEW regional offices did not have sufficient time to make a "proper determination that the grants were made in accordance with program regulations or that the grants were in line with the purpose of the program." A second GAO study of 28 districts receiving ESAP-I funds reported that 24 of the districts were qualified for ESAP funds and that there were unresolved problems related to ESAP assurances in 3 districts. One district was determined to be ineligible because it was not in the final stage of desegregation. Weaknesses in project implementation were attributed by GAO to the need for speed and the lack of an effective HEW regional office monitoring system.

Seventy-one termination actions were initiated by the Office of the General Counsel for the ESAP I program. In 32 cases voluntary compliance was achieved without the need for administrative hearing, leaving 39 cases in which termination hearings were conducted. Compliance was achieved in 2 cases after hearings, and the proceedings in 2 other cases were dismissed after hearings. Of the remaining 35 cases, termination was ordered in 15 cases and denied in 20.

Program Effectiveness of ESAP-1 Community Groups

A evaluation was conducted in thirteen states in the south and southwest which had ESAP-Community Group programs designed to promote community participation in school desegregation, maintain quality education during desegregation, aid in curriculum revision, establish communication between previously segregated student bodies, and help provide comprehensive planning and logistical support to implement desegregation plans.

Thirty-five of the 150 ESAP-CG projects funded, accounting for $1.4 million in funding, were the subject of an evaluation by Kirschner Associates, Inc. under contract to the Office of Education. Project grantees in the sample fell into one of six categories: national or regional organizations (3), universities or colleges (6), local community groups with considerable experience in desegregation efforts (6), local groups with moderate experience (10), local groups with virtually no experience (8), and two projects that did not fit any of the foregoing categories. The last four categories included a wide variety of organizations including religious groups, PTAs, community action groups, TV stations, etc.

The study found that during the winter of 1971-72 a wide variety of activities were undertaken by the community groups but that they could be grouped into six categories as follows:

Activity	Percent of Total Activities
Educational support	27
Information dissemination, public relations	21
Group interaction: eg., seminars, workshops	17
Recreational, social and cultural activities	12
Counseling and training programs	11
Other	12

Since the main threat of the evaluation was simply to determine what the community groups did, there was no attempt to directly measure the impact of their activities. However, impressionistic evidence on project activities was obtained by soliciting opinions and perceptions from individuals, both associated with the projects and not, in the communities where projects operated. With respect to how well community group projects were able to cope with desegregation problems, respondents rated the projects as most effective in the areas of student racial relations and school-community relations. These were also two of the most commonly reported problem areas arising from desegregation.

In about 60% of the communities, respondents from civil rights groups and local education agencies described the image of the projects as positive. The view of the general public was somewhat less favorable in that a positive image was reported in 42% of the communities. The general public also accounted for the greatest number of negative images reported (23%).

Program Effectiveness of ESAP-II School District Grants

Grant award procedures for ESAP-II apparently were successful in directing funds to districts in which there has been progress in desegregation. The Fall, 1971 Office for Civil Rights Survey revealed that school districts which received ESAP-II funds were more nearly desegregated than the rest of the southern and border state school districts. Seventy-five percent (75%) of 433 ESAP-II districts included in the report had a Desegregation Index (D.I.)* of at least .90 compared to 67% for OCR's sample of southern and border state school districts. In terms of students served, 46% of the minority students in ESAP-II districts were in districts of at least .90, whereas only 32% of the minority children in the districts of the southern and border states generally were in such highly desegregated districts.

An evaluation of ESAP-II school district grants was conducted under contract to OE by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). A sample of 600 elementary and secondary schools in 103 districts was selected from the universe of school districts which received ESAP-II district grants in 11 southern states.

---

* The D.I. indicates the average amount of minority isolation in a school district relative to the overall percentage minority in the district by combining the percentage minority for each school in the district, weighted by the size of the school, and dividing by the district percentage minority. If all schools in a district have the district ratio of minority students, the D.I. equals 1.00. If all schools are completely segregated, the D.I. equals .00. Intermediate values represent intermediate levels of desegregation.

Approximately one-half of the schools in the sample were randomly assigned to an experimental/control design in which schools in the control group did not receive ESAP-II funds. This design was adopted because it enables the investigator to determine the effects of ESAP funding in schools by comparing such schools to similar schools that did not receive ESAP-II funds.

NORC's analyses of the data will provide information about program effects on achievement and racial attitudes for schools with various patterns of student enrollment, desegregation experience, and community environments. Although the final report will not be available until Summer, 1973, useful data are available on the types of activities funded under ESAP-II.

Table 1 provides estimates of the frequency with which ESAP-II funds were used for various activities in all schools in districts funded under ESAP-II. These activities are grouped under the same seventeen categories used in the ESAP-I evaluation, and the frequency rankings reported in the ESAP-I evaluation also are listed in Table 1 as a guide to changes in program emphasis from ESAP-I to ESAP-II. The most striking differences in program emphasis are a decline in the relative importance of teacher aides and a sharp increase in the importance of community relations activities and administration expenditures. The decline in busing activities reflects the low priority given to transportation expenditures. Among the four activities reported in the ESAP-I evaluation as effective, only one, counseling, showed an increase in emphasis in ESAP-II. In contrast there appears to have been continued emphasis on teacher in-service education, which was reported as the most ineffective activity in the RMC evaluation of ESAP-I. However, only preliminary results of the RMC study were available at the time of grant awards. One should also note that a rank ordering of these activities based on the criterion of the number of ESAP-II program dollars expended would probably be somewhat different than the ordering based on the frequency of activities shown in Table 1. Such a ranking was attempted in the ESAP-I evaluation and showed different orderings for some activities. However, the budgeting and accounting procedures of most schools restrict one's ability to determine previously what services the program dollars actually bought.

The effect of ESAP-II on services offered in the school can be determined from a comparison of those schools in the evaluation design that received ESAP funds with those that did not. At the elementary level ESAP schools had more guidance programs, usually more remedial reading programs and tutoring programs, and purchased more new testing materials than non-ESAP schools. ESAP funds are apparently not very frequently supplemented to provide the traditional supplementary staff for schools -- gym teachers, librarians, music teachers, etc. The ESAP schools are not more

TABLE 1

ESAP'S IMPACT ON THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

	Estimated Proportion of ESAP-II Districts	Rankings in ESAP-II	Rankings in ESAP-I
Teacher in-service education	.84	1	3
non-ethnic classes, materials	.73	2	2
other materials	.66	3	5
personal community activities	.64	4	11
teacher's aides	.61	5	1
administration	.54	6	10
non-personal community relations	.44	7	9
remedial programs	.37	8	7
student-to-student activities	.31	9	5
counseling support	.31	10	7
counseling	.31	11	15
ethnic classes, materials	.28	12	12
remedial personnel	.27	13	11
comprehensive planning	.10	14	16
facilities	.07	15	3
busing	.01	*	12
other	.18	*	*

* category not ranked

likely to have team teaching, demonstration classrooms, ungraded classrooms, or achievement grouping.

ESAP funds are used in a quite different way in high schools. This is not surprising since it is well known that problems of desegregation are more serious with adolescents. At the high school level major expenditures are in the area of developing community relations programs, extra curricular activities and student inter-group relations, programs to improve inter-group relations among teachers, and teacher's aides. Funds are also devoted to tutoring programs and the support of biracial student advisory committees. This pattern of findings indicates that southern school administrators have expended ESAP funds to work on problems of intergroup relations in the high schools, and to solve problems of morale and delinquency among high school students.

The ESAP-funded schools are also more likely to have in-service training for teachers, more instructional equipment, and are more likely to have revised their curriculum.

In both high schools and elementary schools, ESAP funds are often used to purchase supplies and materials and equipment. The directors of the ESAP programs in the school district report that teaching materials were provided to 63 percent of the schools and audio visual equipment to 41 percent.

The Office of the General Counsel initiated 24 termination proceedings under ESAP-II and its FY 73 continuing resolution. Compliance was achieved in 2 cases and the proceeding was dismissed in another case after the defendant terminated its own participation in the program. Of the other 21 proceedings, termination was ordered in 7 and denied in 7, and 7 cases are still pending.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

1. Evaluation of ESAP-II School District Program - being conducted by the National Opinion Research Center.
2. Study of the Identification of Exemplary Desegregated Schools and Evaluation of the Determinants of Success - contract has not been awarded yet.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, Resource Management Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland, 1971.
2. Need to Improve Policies and Procedures for Approving Grants under the Emergency School Assistance, General Accounting Office, 1971.
3. Weaknesses in School Districts' Implementation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, General Accounting Office, 1971.
4. The Emergency School Assistance Program: An Evaluation, prepared by Washington Research Project and five other civil rights organizations, 1970.
5. Surveys of HEW Office of Civil Rights (Surveys of ESAP and other LEAs to determine numbers of minority students and teachers).
6. Memorandum: Summary of 1971-72 ESAP Program in Southern School Districts, NORC, November 28, 1972.
7. Emergency School Assistance Program -- Community Group, Kirschner Associates, Inc., November 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Title IV, Equal Educational Opportunities

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352)	indefinite

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	indefinite	$6,000,000
	1966		6,275,000
	1967		6,535,000
	1968		8,500,000
	1969		9,250,000
	1970		12,000,000
	1971		16,000,000
	1972		14,600,000
	1973		21,700,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title IV is designed to provide assistance with problems incident to school desegregation. Section 403 of the act provides for technical assistance during the preparation, adoption, or implementation of a school desegregation plan to any governmental unit legally responsible for operating a public school or schools upon submission of application to the Commissioner of Education. Such assistance is normally provided through technical assistance centers maintained in various universities or through SEA's. Section 404 authorizes the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation. Section 405 of the act authorizes the Commissioner, upon application of a school board, to make grants to such board to pay, in whole or in part the cost of (a) inservice training for teachers and other school personnel, (b) employing specialists to advise in problems incident to desegregation.

Under section 403, 33 State departments of education received Title IV funds for 1971-72 and the Council of the Great City Schools received funds to provide technical assistance services tommember cities of the Research Council of Great City Schools. In addition to a national desegregation center at Teachers College Columbia University in New York, a national training institute at the University of Hartford, and a grant to the University of California at Riverside, 15 universities in 14 southern states also received Title IV funds to operate desegregation assistance centers. Under section4405, 108 grants were made to LEAs in FY 1972, down from the total of 140 LEA grants in the previous year.

Program Effectiveness:

The effectiveness of Title IV (P. L. 88-352) must be based primarily on qualitative evidence. The program does not lend itself to quantitative measures of performance and the qualitative evidence is subject to differing interpretations. The most significant differences in opinions involve the role of the Title IV University Desegregation Centers. A report filed in 1971 by the Washington Research Project, an independent non-government agency, concluded that the performance of the centers was uneven; they operate in isolation in that they have no viable relationship with other federal programs, regional educational labs, or the Office for Civil Rights, and in general, they do not consult with groups dealing with school desegregation litigation. The report found a lack of leadership by the Office of Education in setting standards and initiating communication among the centers. It further found that the Centers were "unable to resolve what they perceive to be conflicting roles--that of desegregation plan development and provisions of educational services, and have never carried on both roles creatively."

The comments of the Washington Research Project were supported in an independent report of March, 1970 prepared by the Race Relations Information Center of Nashville, Tennessee. One significant conclusion in this report was that in some cases Title IV was being used as a means of evading desegregation, or stalling for more time.

A report released in January 1973 by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights critically reviewed the history of the program and recommended several changes in program administration. Among the major criticisms in the report were the observations that the LEA projects were primarily directed and staffed by local school district personnel who seldom had influence over LEA policies on desegregation, and that the State Title IV units and the university desegregation centers were predominately staffed by white southerners whose previous education and experience were obtained in segregated southern school systems. One result has been that the programs developed with Title IV assistance frequently have been geared to making minority students conform to white middle class values and standards of achievement. On the basis of this and evidence that Title IV grants to LEAs and university desegregation centers have been used to fund training programs in compensatory education without emphasis on the problems of desegregation, the report recommended that the Office of Education adopt clear guidelines requiring that the primary emphasis of all projects must deal directly with problems of desegregation and that all Title IV recipients must be required to assure appropriate representation of all racial and ethnic groups, on an integrated basis, in staffing the project. The report also suggested giving priority to adequately funding those project applications that have the highest likelihood that Title IV assistance will be helpful rather than distributing the funds generally as an entitlement program.

The Commission report also suggested that the Office of Education should sponsor an annual training institute for representatives of current and potential Title IV recipients which would assure a common understanding of objectives, strategies, and permissable activities, which has been lacking throughout the history of the program. Criticizing the lack of reliable, systematic evaluation information on the effectiveness of Title IV, the report recommended that additional funds be provided for evaluation of all Title IV projects by a unit of the Office of Education independent of the Title IV office or by contract with private organizations. The refunding of any Title IV project would be contingent upon completion of this evaluation.

Previous evaluations of Title IV had discussed the incongruous roles of the university desegregation centers in attempting both to be conciliatory assistance centers to desegregating LEAs and to provide technical expertise to federal courts in desegregation litigation against LEAs. In January 1972 the Office of Education forbade university desegregation centers from continuing to provide this assistance to courts except at the specific request of an LEA. The Commission report criticized this change in policy, recommending that the Office of Education "require (Title IV) recipients to offer the full range of their knowledge and experience in helping to devise workable desegregation plans." In monitoring the performance of Title IV recipients, the Commission recommended that the Office of Education withhold further contract payments and use fund recovery mechanisms to force unwilling recipients to participate in the preparation of school desegregation plans and to testify in desegregation litigation.

The Office of Education has acknowledged a number of the criticisms of program administration that were made in the Commission report and earlier reports. In an effort to concentrate program funds on those projects which evidence the greatest potential for facilitating school desegregation, new grant application procedures for FY 73 will require applications for State Title IV centers and technical assistance centers to provide documentation of a demand for a center with LEA requests for assistance in desegregation problems. Appropriate staffing in Title IV projects will be encouraged through application ratings which give more credit to proposals whose staff are experienced in desegregation assistance and representative in racial or ethnic composition of the population to be served. Also, the new guidelines require LEA grantees to employ an experienced advisory specialist who will have direct and frequent access to the district superintendent. Although applications also will receive favorable ratings for having organized plans for self-evaluation, the Commission report's specific recommendation for independent evaluations of all Title IV projects has not been implemented.

The Office of Education responded to the Commission report's criticism of the policy of forbidding Title IV recipients from responding to court requests for assistance by stressing that the program legislation only allows technical assistance to be provided upon the request of a school district and that previous assistance to courts had been provided in the absence of clarification of the legislation. It also said that public and private institutions of higher education must receive equal and fair consideration in funding decisions and that contractual obligations of Title IV recipients have been enforced, resulting in termination of two State Education Agency contracts in FY 72.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No formal evaluation is planned for FY 73.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program reports.

2. Race Relations Information Center, Nashville, Tennessee, Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act: A Program in Search of a Policy, March, 1970.

3. Washington Research Project, "University Title IV Centers," 1971 (Unpublished).

4. DHEW, "Review of the Set of Findings Developed by the Education Coalitition Concerning the Programs and Operations of the University Title IV Centers," (Unpublished), 1971.

5. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Title IV and School Desegregation: A Study of a Neglected Federal Program, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., January, 1973.

B. Education for the Handicapped Programs

1. State Grant Program
2. Aid to States for Education of Handicapped Children in State Operated Schools
3. Regional Resource Centers
4. Deaf/Blind Centers
5. Early Childhood Education
6. Special Education Manpower Development
7. Recruitment and Information
8. Innovation and Development
9. Media Services and Captioned Films
10. Specific Learning Disabilities

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Grant Program

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part B -
Assistance to States for Education
of Handicapped Children

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967	$51,500,000	$2,475,000
	1968	154,500,000	15,000,000
	1969	167,375,000	29,250,000
	1970	206,000,000	29,190,000
	1971	206,000,000	34,000,000
	1972	216,300,000	37,499,000
	1973	226,600,000	37,500,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Non-matching grants to the States are made to assist in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of education of handicapped children at the pre-school, elementary, and secondary levels. Funds are allocated to the States in proportion to the States' populations in the age range of 3 to 21 (minimum allocation of $200,000). Up to 5% or $100,000 of the State grant may be used for administration of educational programs for the handicapped by State Education Agencies.

Seven million children (one million of pre-school age) are estimated to be handicapped by mental retardation, speech problems, emotional disorders, deafness, blindness, crippling conditions or other health impairments that can be expected to cause school failure, emotional problems and retarded development unless special educational procedures are available to them. At present, only 40% of school-age handicapped children are receiving special education, and in some States only 10-15% of the children are receiving this help. Approximately one million of these unserved children do not participate in any educational program.

The Federal strategy for the development of the program has been to serve as a catalyst to local and State program growth rather than providing full Federal support for a limited number of children. Joint planning with the States has led to increased programming for children on a comprehensive basis involving various Federal programs and local resources, e.g., Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Titles I and III, Vocational Education Act, etc. In 1972, approximately 2,000 projects were supported by Title VI-B funds; of these, about one-third were new projects. MOre than 500 projects begun in previous years under these Federal funds were continued using State and local resources. More than 200,000 children participated directly in Federally supported projects under this program. Cooperative efforts between special education, vocational education and vocational rehabilitation at Federal and State levels has led to approximately 150,000 handicapped children receiving pre-vocational or vocational education under the provision of the Vocational Education Act.

The program helped to stimulate educational opportunities, supported by non-Federal funds, for 215,000 handicapped children in 1972 by providing developmental and technical assistance to twenty-five States (in a continuing program) in designing new programs, coordinating Federal and State funding, and developing strategies for increasing services to handicapped children. A number of States modified their statutes to allow for services to children following models of Federal programming.

Program Effectiveness:

To date, no formal assessment of the program has been completed and the evidence of program effectiveness can be demonstrated only in terms of the number of projects receiving Federal support, the numbers of children reached, and by the technical assistance provided to the States.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of the impact of this program is currently underway in a representative sample of 50 States and approximately 630 local school districts. This study is intended to determine (a) current impact and (b) methods, if any, of increasing impact. The study will be completed by March, 1973.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Evaluation of An Aid-to-States Program for Education of Handicapped Children by Exotech Systems, Inc.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Aid to States for Education of Handicapped Children in State-Operated and State-supported Schools.

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
ESEA Title I, Section 103(a)(5), commonly known as PL. 89-313	June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION [1]	APPROPRIATION
	1966		$15,900,000
	1967		15,100,000
	1968		24,700,000
	1969		29,700,000
	1970		37,500,000
	1971		46,100,000
	1972		56,400,000
	1973		60,938,942 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

The program provides federal assistance to State-operated and State-supported schools and for other institutions for handicapped children to support educational programs. Institutions which qualify for participation range from those which provide full-year residential programs to those which provide special itinerant services on a part-day basis for handicapped children enrolled in regular day schools or who may be confined to their homes because of severe handicapping conditions. In each instance, a substantial part of the educational costs are borne by a State agency (SA) rather than a local agency. Participating institutions serve one or more categories of handicapped children, including mentally retarded, hard-of-hearing, deaf, speech-impaired, visually impaired, seriously emotionally disturbed, and crippled or other health-impaired children.

Federal funds under this program are determined by a formula which specifies that, for each handicapped child in average daily attendance (ADA) in an elementary or secondary educational program operated or supported by a

---

1/ The Authorization level under this legislation is determined by formula and taken from the total Title I appropriation prior to any other allocation of Title I funds. See text for definition of the formula.

State agency, the SA receives an amount equal to half the State expenditure for child enrolled in its public schools, or half of the National average, whichever is higher.

At the Federal level, organizational responsibility for this program is vested in the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH). Allocations under the program, as determined by BEH, are issued to State agencies. Applications for projects funds are then submitted by participating institutions to their supervising State agency. The SA reviews the applications, and forwards those which it approves to the State educational agency (SEA) for final approval and the release of funds. The participating institution is required to submit end-of-project reports to its SA to account for the expenditure of funds and to provide an evaluation of project activities.

State agencies submit copies of project applications which they approved and end-of-project reports to BEH. In addition, State agencies report fiscal information about their projects to the USOE Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education to provide data for a composite ESEA Title I financial report.

At the State level, all P.L. 89-313 funds are directly administered by participating State agencies which are responsible for providing educational services to handicapped children. However, the agencies operate their programs under the over-all supervision of the State educational agency. For example, allocation of these funds go to the following types of State agencies: Education, Health, Welfare, Mental Health or Hygiene, and Institutions. In all cases applications for project funds are first reviewed by the supervising State agency and then referred to the State Education Agency for final approval.

In FY 1972, approximately $56.4 million were allocated to 49 States, [2] the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and Guam. Allocations to States ranged from a low of $115,044 for Nevada, based on its reported average daily attendance of 300 handicapped children, to $7,253,392 for New York, based on its ADA of 11,466 children. The per pupil amount used in establishing allocations varied from one-half the National average expenditure for each child enrolled in public schools--$383.48, which figure was used as the basis for determining allocations to 30 State, to the high of $632.60 for the State of New York.

The funds allocated were administered by 132 State agencies which supervised project participation at 2,777 schools for handicapped children. The average daily attendance reported by these institutions was 131,831 children for the school year 1969-70, the attendance-year data used in establishing the FY 1972 allocations. Those children benefiting under the program are distributed

---

2/ Alaska had not applied for P.L. 89-313 participation in FY 1972; it is participating in FY 1973 across the following handicap categories approximately as follows: Mentally Retarded-58.7%; Deaf and Hard of Hearing-16.3%; Emotionally Disturbed-12.5%; Crippled and Other Health Impaired-6.5%; Visually Handicapped-6.0%.

Program Effectiveness:

To date no formal assessment of the program has been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study of this program is currently underway in a sample of 25 states and approximately 900 institutions. The objectives of this study are (a) to assess the impact of the program and (b) to determine if the impact can be increased. The study will be completed in April, 1974.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
2. Evaluation of Educational Programs in State-operated and State-supported Schools for Handicapped Children by Exotech Systems, Inc.

2

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Regional Resource Centers

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C -
Centers and Services to Meet Special
Needs of the Handicapped, Sec. 621

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$7,750,000	
	1969	7,750,000	$ 500,000
	1970	10,000,000	1,800,000
	1971*		3,550,000
	1972*		3,550,000
	1973*		7,243,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides authority for grants and contracts to institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, or nonprofit private organizations, to establish and operate regional centers. The purpose of these centers is to develop and apply methods of determining the special needs of children and to provide services to meet those needs. The regional resource centers function to meet the requirements of the teacher serving the handicapped child. The objective is to provide every teacher serving the handicapped children with the necessary assistance and resources. One of the major problems inhibiting the education of the handicapped child has been the lack of good diagnostic tools and instructional resources. The classroom teacher of the handicapped child, because of a lack of supportive resources, has had to be diagnostician, curriculum development specialist, educational evaluator, and media specialist. Professional services to accomplish these tasks are needed. The regional resource center concept is an attempt to meet this need.

---

* Total of $36,500,000 in 1971, $51,500,000 in 1972, and $66,500,000 in 1973, is authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

As of FY 72 trained personnel have begun to move into schools on a trial basis in order to provide guidance and assistance to teachers who need help. To meet the resource center needs of the Southeastern part of the United States, a consortium of centers was designed, capitalizing on existing resources in each State. Seven workshops were conducted over a ten State area to provide teachers with more appropriate educational approaches. Center personnel focused their efforts on inner-city, rural and geographically isolated areas. The program added a learning resource component in the upper Midwest to provide financial resources to enable States in that area to purchase services without setting up totally new centers.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal evaluations have yet been conducted of this program and its effectiveness cannot be ascertained from reports now available. Some centers are still in the implementation phase while other established centers do not yet have systematic reporting requirements which would indicate how many children or teachers have been served.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study is tentatively scheduled for FY 1975, at which time the program should have been in operation long enough to have had impact.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Deaf-Blind Centers

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C - Centers and Services to Meet Special Needs of The Handicapped, Sec. 622

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$3,000,000	
	1969	3,000,000	$1,000,000
	1970	7,000,000	2,000,000
	1971*		4,500,000
	1972*		7,500,000
	1973*		10,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides for grants or contracts to public and nonprofit private organizations to establish and operate centers for deaf-blind children, and to develop and apply with these children specialized, intensive services. Such services should enable them to achieve their full potential for communication, adjustment to and participation in society, and self-fulfillment.

The Deaf-Blind Centers program through a system of contracted services with existing agencies, has developed more than 100 programs and projects with the support of Federal funds. These programs and projects have coordinated the following resources and services for deaf-blind children and their families: Educational services to 952 children (residential: 665, and day schools: 287); crisis care services for 26 children and their parents; diagnostic and educational assessment services to 533 children; parent counseling programs for parents of 944 children not enrolled in formal educational programs; and inservice training for 400 educators, professionals, and parent.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessments have yet been completed of this program.

---

* Total of $36,500,000 in 1971, $51,500,000 in 1972, and $66,500,000 in 1973, is authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A formal evaluation of this program will probably be done in FY 1975 depending on availability of funds.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Program Name:

Early Childhood Education

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C - Centers and Services to Meet Special Needs of the Handicapped, Sec. 623

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$1,000,000	$ 945,000
	1970	10,000,000	3,000,000
	1971*		7,000,000
	1972*		7,500,000
	1973*		12,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants and contracts on a matching basis to stimulate the development of comprehensive educational services for young (0-8 years) handicapped children with a primary focus on the preschool age level (0-5) years. The objective is to encourage growth of early childhood services for all pre-school aged handicapped children in Federal, State, and local educational and day care programs to prevent and reduce the debilitating effects of a handicap upon the children. Between 50% and 75% of these children fall into the categories of mild retardation, emotional disturbance, and of specific learning disbilities. REsearch findings indicate that many of these children, with early childhood programming, would have an excellent chance of overcoming their handicaps by developing compensatory skills so that they can attend regular classes. The alternative to early education is usually attendance in special classes for the handicapped which are expensive and may be too late to help a child develop his potential.

---

* Total of $36,500,000 in 1971, $51,500,000 in 1972, and $66,500,000 in 1973, is authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

Community services available for education of the preschool handicapped are very limited. The majority of the programs in existence operate on a tuition basis, making their services unavailable to children of low income families. Even in publicly supported programs children have a difficult time gaining admission. Federal support, leadership, and demonstration funds are designed to influence States and local school districts throughout the country to initiate and maintain public programs in preschool and early education.

In FY 1972, under the Early Childhood Program, 70 model projects were funded to stimulate and influence the development of additional services to preschool handicapped children. Approximately 4,000 children and 8,000 parents received direct services. Inservice staff training was provided for 6,000 professional and paraprofessional staff members. Additional projects were funded with ESEA Title III and EHA Title VI-B funds; it is estimated that these projects provided services to about 35,000 children.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal evaluations of this program have yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A purely descriptive study of the 22 first-year projects is now in progress and is scheduled for completion by January, 1973. The objective of this study is to provide information useful for future planning and more efficient program management. A rigorous evaluation study is scheduled to begin in FY 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Early Childhood Education Evaluation, Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education

Evaluation of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program, work statement to be issed as part of an RFP in January, 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Education Manpower Development

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part D - Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 631-2 and Sec. 634

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$14,500,000	$14,500,000
	1966	19,500,000	19,500,000
	1967	29,500,000	24,500,000
	1968	34,000,000	24,500,000
	1969	37,500,0-0	29,700,000
	1970	55,000,000	29,900,000
	1971*		31,900,000
	1972*		34,406,000
	1973*		37,610,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides for grants to institutions of higher education, State education agencies, and other non-profit agencies to prepare teachers, teacher educators, researchers, speech correctionists and other special service personnel to educate the handicapped. To extend quality educational service to all handicapped children under current teacher-student ratios and current patterns of instructional organization will require an additional 245,000 teachers for school age children and 60,000 for preschool children. Upgrading and updating the 125,000 special education teachers currently employed, of whom nearly one-half are uncertified, is also necessary.

This program attacks the problem by use of Federal grants to increase the number of teachers trained, by development of new models for improved effectiveness, and by targeting resources on crucial areas of need.

---

* A total of $69,500,000 in 1971, $87,000,000 in 1972, and $103,500,000 in 1973, is authorized for Part D, EHA.

Program Effectiveness:

One measure of effectiveness of this program is the training of additional special education manpower.

In calendar year 1971 the number of institutions receiving grants under the Teacher Education program increased by 43 to a total of 304. Special effort to provide program development grants for institutions serving predominantly black students and rural populations was partially responsible for this increase. In the Fall of 1972 approximately 12,500 additional trained teachers and specialists will be available to serve the additional 250,000 handicapped children entering the system. An additional 30 new programs were established in fiscal year 1972 for priority areas of manpower needs: rural areas, predominantly black colleges, early childhood education, and career education.

The Physical Education and Recreation Training program will place an additional 120 specialists to serve handicapped children in the schools and community physical education recreation programs by Fall of 1972; upgrade and update with information about the handicapped at least 300 physical education and recreation personnel; add one new training program to the 26 existing in 1971, and prepare at least 175 specialists for 1973 graduation.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study is in progress and is scheduled for completion by March, 1973. This study will develop further information about the impact of current strategies and will identify alternative strategies which might increase the rate at which Special Education teachers are trained.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

An Evaluation of Federal Programs to Increase the Pool of Special Education Teachers, by RMC, Inc., in progress

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Recruitment and Information

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part D -
Training Personnel for the
Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 633

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$1,000,000	
	1969	1,000,000	$ 250,000
	1970	1,000,000	475,000
	1971*		500,000
	1972*		500,000
	1973*		500,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation.

The program provides non-matching grants or contracts to conduct projects to interest people in entering the career field of special education, and to disseminate information and provide referral services. Great numbers of parents and handicapped children have no information about where to turn for help in educating their children. In addition, an estimated 250,000 teachers are necessary to augment the special education manpower supply. This program is designed to provide an appropriate information and referral service for parents and their handicapped children in order that they may be assisted in their attempts to gain an equal educational opportunity.

The Recruitment and Information program, in 1971-72, in a partial survey, had 644 radio stations report using CLOSER LOOK live announcements and 137 TV stations reporting using the television public service spots in English and Spanish. More than 1-1/2 billion home impressions were recorded. The Special Education Information Center (SEIC) was established in 1970 to survey, computerize and make available information about existing special education programs and facilities to the 125,000 parents and professionals making inquiries resulting from exposure to the TV and radio spots. The SEIC broadened its referral capacity in 1972 to provide advice to parents on the availability of diagnostic and clinical facilities. A total of 300 major colleges and universities were involved in the recruitment activities through distribution of informational material and recruitment brochures. Through a survey conducted on recruitment efforts for Special Education Careers, it became apparent that Armed Services personnel returning to private life could be attracted to Special Education professional and ancillary careers. Joint activities are being implemented with the Armed Services MEDIH[illegible] to follow up.

---

* A total of $69,500,000 in 1971, $87,000,000 in 1972, and $103,500,000 in 1973, is authorized for Part D, EHA.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of this program has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation study of this program is currently planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUALE EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Innovation and Development

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part E - Research in the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 641 & Sec. 642

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
	1966	6,000,000	8,000,000
	1967	9,000,000	8,100,000
	1968	12,000,000	11,100,000
	1969	14,000,000	12,800,000
	1970	18,000,000	12,060,000
	1971	27,000,000	15,000,000
	1972	35,500,000	11,176,000
	1973	45,000,000	9,916,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the innovation and development program is to improve educational opportunities for handicapped children.. More specifically, the program's purposes are to:

a. identify, refine, demonstrate, and put into appropriate hands, solutions to specific identified problems concerning education of the handicapped; and

b. develop, demonstrate, and disseminate innovative support systems and techniques to improve the performance of teachers and other practitioners, serving the handicapped.

This is accomplished through support of applied research and related activities. The Physical Education and Recreation Research program provides support for research and other activities relative to the needs and performance of handicapped children in the area of physical education and recreation.

In the Research and Demonstration program, specific accomplishments included: (a) research demonstrating that retarded children can be taught effective strategies for learning; various learning approaches and teaching materials can be appropriately tailored to the learning styles of young retarded children; (b) research efforts have demonstrated that children with very restricted amounts of residual vision, blind by legal definition, can benefit from instruction in the use of their residual vision; (c) a major and continuing curriculum development program for retarded children involved more than 200 classes of educable mentally retarded children during the course of its development and evaluation efforts; (d) three model demonstration programs in the area of post-secondary school vocational training for hearing impaired youth were supported; and (e) a computer assisted course of instruction was designed to familiarize regular teachers with the identification of handicapped children in their classrooms. Efforts were concentrated on priority areas of (1) preschool education; (2) increased services to school-age children; and (3) special education manpower development. Support is being provided for approximately 20 new projects, 35 continuing projects, and 5 research and development centers.

In the Physical Education and Recreation Research program, funded projects provided a set of guidelines for implementing a physical education program for seriously mentally retarded and multiple handicapped children, and a curriculum that promises to prove useful for mildly retarded children. In addition, researchers studied the relationships between a variety of perceptual, ability, behavioral, and social skill variables and those of a physical performance nature in a group of emotionally disturbed elementary school boys to determine optimum specific physical education programming; in one State a mobile van provided workshops, demonstrations, services, and conferences to people interested in initiating programs.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has been completed. However, a recently concluded management evaluation identified three areas where improvement is needed. These are: (a) definition of program goals and objectives; (b) selection of research projects for funding; (c) monitoring of ongoing research projects. As regards definition of program goals and objectives, the contractor indicated that insufficient effort is directed toward definition of long-range goals and development of short-range objectives that will result in accomplishment of the program goals. In addition, the relationship of Innovation and Development goals to the overall goals of the Bureau and of the Office of Education is poor, i.e., the program goals are not derived from the overall goals.

The contractor also identified weaknesses in the process for selecting research projects for funding. First, since the goals and objectives of the program are not well-defined, the projects which are awarded funds are not systematically focused on achievement of program objectives. Secondly, the selection process has a strong tendency to exclude innovative research and to surface projects in traditional areas of inquiry. Finally, there is insufficient negotiation on the technical aspects of proposal and too much emphasis on negotiation of price.

The contractor also indicated that the monitoring of grants and contracts is weak. There is no uniform reporting system for project monitors and because of this there is inadequate documentation of research activities. In addition, project monitoring is not continuous with the result that timely identification of problems in a project occurs by chance.

The Bureau has begun work toward improving articulation of goals and objectives with program operation and in improving its selection and monitoring processes.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No studies are planned for the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Management Review: Division of Research, Vol. 3, URS Research Company, October, 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Media Services and Captioned Films

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part F -
Instructional Media for the
Handicapped, Sec. 652 and 653

Expiration Date:

Indefinite

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		$1,384,000
	1966		2,800,000
	1967	$3,000,000	2,800,000
	1968	8,000,000	2,800,000
	1969	8,000,000	4,750,000
	1970	10,000,000	4,750,000
	1971	12,500,000	6,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	10,478,000
	1973	20,000,000	13,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to make available to handicapped persons a portion of the entertainment and educational films, video tapes, records, etc. that are available to the general public and to develop appropriate educational technology for use by handicapped pupils and their teachers. The program is also concerned with the development and implementation of systems to assure that such materials become available for classroom use. Handicapped persons, their parents, potential employees, employers and other workers with the handicapped are eligible to receive services from this program.

Today's educational systems depend heavily upon the use of educational media such as films, records, television, and other instructional materials. In such a school system, the handicapped child is doubly disadvantaged. In addition to being handicapped, the nature of a child's handicapping condition may limit his ability to use these materials. Thus, the need to adapt educational materials for use by handicapped children is the basis of this program.

Within the Media Services and Captioned Films program the Education Media Distribution Center comprised of three general entertainment and educational film distribution centers, 60 educational film depositories and a central office, continued to provide a delivery service of captioned films to deaf children and adults, and teacher training films for a variety of handicapping conditions. A service of supplying films to teacher training programs was expanded to include 24 national and international film studies on education of the deaf and education of the retarded. The national network of 14 Instructional Materials Centers and 4 Regional Media Centers has expanded its activities in evaluation, cataloging, and distribution of educational materials for the special needs of the handicapped. The Center program, originally developed under the research authority, has been transferred into an operational service program. The Centers have coordinated the growth of approximately 300 Associate Centers (at the State and local levels) which are intended to increase the capacity of this program to reach classroom teachers and parents of handicapped children. A National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped was also established to centralize the several network functions which previously had overlapped among various individual Centers (e.g. computer retrieval of materials).

The Computer Based Resource Units were expanded from 15,000 to 250,000 so that 50,000 teachers would be provided detailed planning aids. Development and evaluation of the use of media in early childhood education was expanded, as well as experimentation with network television to include captioned messages for the deaf population.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of this program is tentatively scheduled for FY 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

ANNUALE EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Specific Learning Disabilities

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part G -
Special Programs for Children With
Specific Learning Disabilities

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969		
	1970	$12,000,000	$1,000,000
	1971	20,000,000	$1,000,000
	1972	31,000,000	2,250,000
	1973	31,000,000	3,250,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

In a 1969 report of the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, the prevalence estimate for children with specific learning disabilities, is 1 to 3 percent of school age population (5-19 years) i.e., 600,000 to 1,800,000. Because recognition of this handicap has been relatively recent, Federal activities are designed to help define the nature of the disorders and their treatment and to stimulate an increased supply of teachers. In academic year 1968-69 there were 9,400 trained teachers serving children with specific learning disabilities and an estimated 25,000 additional teachers needed. Competitive grants are made through SEA's to public and nonprofit private organizations to demonstrate effective programs for establishing and operating model centers for children with specific learning disabilities, and to establish program plans within States for meeting the educational requirements of these children. The Special Learning Disabilities program is funding 20 projects currently. Through desmonstrations provided by these projects and other forms of technical assistance it is hoped that States will develop programs for children with Special Learning Disabilities.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of this program has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Because of its small size and short existence, no evaluation study is currently planned for this program.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

C. Vocational and Adult Education Programs

1. Vocational and Technical Education: Basic Grants to States
2. Vocational and Technical Education: Programs for Students with Special Needs
3. Vocational and Technical Education: Research and Training
4. Vocational and Technical Education: Exemplary Programs
5. Vocational and Technical Education: Consumer and Homemaking Education
6. Vocational and Technical Education: Cooperative Education Programs
7. Vocational and Technical Education: Work Study Programs
8. Vocational and Technical Education: Curriculum Development
9. Adult Basic Education: Basic Grants to States
10. Adult Basic Education: Special Projects
11. Adult Basic Education: Teacher Training
12. Manpower Development and Training Programs

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Basic Grants to States

Legislation:

Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended 1968, Part B

Expiration Date:

Permanent

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION*
	1965	$156,641,000	$156,446,000
	1966	209,741,000	209,741,000
	1967	252,491,000	248,216,000
	1968	252,491,000	249,300,000
	1969	314,500,000	248,216,000
	1970	503,500,000	300,336,000
	1971	602,500,000	315,302,000
	1972	502,500,000	376,682,000
	1973	508,500,000	376,682,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States to assist them in conducting vocational education programs for persons of all ages with the objective of insuring that education and training programs for career vocations are available to all individuals who desire and need such education and training for gainful employment. States are required to set aside 15 percent for vocational education for the disadvantaged; 15 percent for post-secondary programs; and 10 percent for vocational education for the handicapped. Funds may be used for the construction of area vocational education facilities. States are required to match one dollar for every Federal dollar.

Under the provisions of P.L. 92-318, the definition of vocational and technical education has been expanded to include industrial arts education and the training of volunteer firemen.

Comprehensive career education is now being stressed involving the restructuring of the entire school system around the career development theme; featuring extensive community, industrial, and business involvement; making heavy use of cooperative education to equip all students for work or further education.

---

* This does not include the permanent authorization and appropriation of $7.1 million apportioned to the States each year under the Smith-Hughes Act.

Program Effectiveness:

While findings of recent studies indicate that participation in vocational programs increases earnings, the absence of hard data still precludes answering some of the basic questions about characteristics of enrollees and the performance of students after graduating from high school. New analyses of recent studies are providing further insights into these questions and baseline data from the National Longitudinal Study of the Class of 1972, which includes a sizeable sample of vocational students, will be available early in 1973.

Vocational Impact Study:

Findings from the Vocational Impact Study, a three-part study completed in 1972, provides detailed analyses of available data from recent studies of vocational students, data examining the impact of the 1968 amendments and information about the duplication, gaps and coordination of publicly funded skill training programs in 20 cities.

Of all studies analyzed, the National Longitudinal surveys (also called the Parnes study) provides the most recent and probably the most reliable data about vocational education. The Parnes study confirms that enrollees of vocational programs do benefit from vocational training and suggests that the influence of vocational education on earnings is more closely related to changes in labor market conditions than had been thought to be the case before. The survey summarized the experience of out-of-school males in the 14 to 26 year age group in the fourth quarters of 1966 and 1968. Survey data show no significant difference in the earnings of out-of-school young males from different high school curriculum in the fourth quarter of 1966, a period of rising unemployment. Significant differences show up during late 1968, when unemployment rates were declining. For this period, statistical analysis which controls for a variety of social and demographic variables shows that the former vocational students earn about $400 more a year than do the former academic students who were in the labor force at the time of the survey and about $275 more than the students with a background in general education. These findings suggest that in periods when rising levels of economic activity reduce the pool of unemployed persons, employers are more likely to seek out the vocational graduates and to utilize their school training as the basis for more specialized on-the-job training. At times when economic activity is slackening and unemployment is rising, the economic premium attached to vocational training diminishes as other persons with work experience compete for the same jobs with recent graduates with little or no experience.

Another study, a case study of three cities, shows that high school graduates from vocational curriculum in the instances surveyed experienced 5 to 10 percentage points more time employed during the six-year follow-up period than was the case with the graduates of the academic curriculum who did not attend college.

The Parnes data provided little evidence that enrollment in vocational programs encourages students to remain in school until they graduate. The national survey data show that the graduate rate for young out-of-school males with backgrounds in the academic curriculum was 21 percentage points higher than for students in the vocational program. For blacks, the differential favoring the academic curriculum was 34 percent. The dropout rates for young males from vocational and general high school programs were similar. Reasons for dropouts are unclear. It may be that vocational students have marketable skills and are thus more dropout prone, or vocational programs attract students who are more likely to drop out.

The study also examines finances and priorities in vocational education.

FUNDS DISTRIBUTED TO URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEMS:

Local Expenditures of Federal Vocational Education Funds, Total as a percent of State-wide expenditures of Federal vocational educational funds, Selected Urban School Systems, 1968 and 1971

	1968	1971	
	% of Federal Expenditures in State	% of Federal Expenditures in State	1970 Population as a % of State Total
Birmingham	10.9	13.2	8.7
Atlanta	13.1	11.3	10.8
Chicago	10.3	15.7	30.3
Louisville	1.4	12.0	11.2
Boston	20.6	2.5	11.3
Detroit	28.8	4.6	17.0
St. Louis	6.9	7.0	13.3
Newark	2.6	4.6	5.3
Cleveland	3.3	6.3	7.1
Philadelphia	1.2	9.6	16.5
Memphis	8.5	15.6	6.6
Seattle	4.1	14.7	15.6
Milwaukee	4.4	17.9	16.2

The share of Federal vocational education funds received by practially all urban school systems changed significantly between 1968 and 1971. Presumably, this is the result of changed State grant mechanisms, particularly the special emphasis on serving disadvantaged students who, in many cases, are concentrated in urban areas. There are anomalous cases, Boston and Detroit, for example, where the city share declined substantially.

However, some indication of priorities is probably evident in the fact that in only 9 of the 43 states for which information has been reported in 1971 was the proportion of vocational education funds spent in urban areas equivalent or greater than the proportion of the state's population living in the metropolitan areas.

Allocations of Federal Funds to Depressed Areas:

Analyses from data in 10 selected states indicated that the percent of spending in depressed areas corresponds generally to the percent of the population residing in those areas.

Comparison of the State's Population Residing in Depressed Areas to the Total Spending in Depressed Areas for the 10 Selected States

1971

State	% State Population in EDAs	% Total Voc. Ed. Funds Spent in EDAs	% Federal Part of EDA Funds	% State-Local Part of EDA Funds
Arizona	INA	4.7	28.0	72.0
Indiana	INA	25.7	30.9	69.1
Kentucky	36.6	41.9	20.0	80.0
Maine	32.2	5.8	62.6	37.4
Missouri	58.7	51.3	31.2	68.8
New Jersey	INA	16.7	28.6	71.4
Oregon	33.3	30.5	18.4	81.6
Pennsylvania	50.3	58.5	12.9	87.1
Texas	7.3	8.5	23.5	76.5
Wyoming	48.7	21.3	10.8	89.2

Taken from information provided in part II of individual state plans, 1971

Allocations to Special Target Population Groups:

For disadvantaged and handicapped populations, there appears to be no relationship between the degree to which a State expended Federal set-aside funds and the investment of State/local funds for these target groups. Data indicates that these were low priority areas in most States and while most States have a formula for establishing priorities, some did not fully expend the Federal set-asides for these groups, the Vocational Impact Study reports.

However, data indicates that post-secondary programs have a high priority in most States and matching ratios also indicate a much greater State/local effort in this category than required by law. The most rapid growth in vocational enrollments in the past five years has taken place in the post-secondary programs.

Enrollment trends, based on State reports are cited below:

	1965	1971	1972*	1976*
Participants:				
Secondary	2,819,000	4,184,000	4,477,000	6,270,000
Postsecondary	207,000	1,035,000	1,185,000	2,200,000
Adult	2,379,000	2,308,000	2,400,000	2,890,000
Disadvantaged	26,000			
Disadvantaged (Included by Level):	NA	785,000	988,000	1,315,000
Handicapped (Included by Level):		169,000	265,000	380,000
Total Enrollment	5,431,000	7,527,000	8,062,000	11,360,000

Increases in enrollment occurred in training programs for shortage occupations. Selected occupational programs are cited:

Instructional Program	1966	1971	Percent Increase
Nurse, Associate Degree	4,215	47,090	1017
Inhalation Therapy	38	3,767	9813
Radiologic Technology	541	4,868	800
Care & Guidance of Children	4,038	49,338	1122
Medical Laboratory Technology	976	5,650	479
Health Assistant	10,122	54,868	442
Electronics Occupations	18,433	95,118	416
Police Science Technology	0	36,099	-
Business Data Processing	42,764	181,313	324

Construction of New Facilities:

During fiscal years 1965-1971 slightly over 1.6 billion dollars of Federal, State, and local funds were approved for building and equipping area vocational schools. This increased the number of vocational schools from 405 in 1965 to 1,889 in 1972 an increase of 1484 schools.

---

* Based on State reports (Estimates)

Federal funds from three legislative sources are largely responsible for this rapid increase in the number and quality of area vocational schools. The following is a breakdown of funding by source of funds for fiscal years 1965 through 1971:

	Funds Approved (Millions) 1965 1971
Vocational Education Amendments	$ 379.4
Appalachian Regional Commission	135.3
Economic Development Act	24.1
State and local funds	1,127.8
	$ 1,666.6

Adult Vocational Education:

Enrollments increased from 2,666,083 in 1970 to 2,859,827 in 1971. This is an increase of 193,744 adults. They were served by 4,808 full-time and 58,775 part-time teachers in over 100 different occupational programs.

The States reported adult enrollment percentages of the National total by racial/ethnic group as: American Indian (.4%), Negro (13.5%), Oriental (.6%) Spanish Surnamed American (5.6%), and other (79.9%).

A Study of Duplication, Gaps and Coordination of Publicly Funded Skill in Training Programs in 20 Cities

Data on more than 390,000 enrollees in 20 cities indicate that 65% were enrolled in secondary vocational education programs. Of the remaining 35 percent who participated in Federal manpower programs, over two-thirds were enrolled in occupational programs in post-secondary institutions. Analysis of enrollee characteristics data indicate that vocational programs and manpower programs serve different populations. Most manpower enrollees are those over 18 years of age with 6th to 10th grade level of educational attainment. Such enrollees rarely find a place in postsecondary institutions which usually have some form of restriction on entering skills training programs even where there is a policy of open admissions, the report concludes.

Several manpower programs, notably Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, offer skill training to the high school age group normally served by secondary vocational programs. Accounting for only two-percent of the secondary school-aged students enrolled in skill training, these programs are primarily for dropouts. They offer the same occupational skills which are available in the better public secondary programs, although the manpower programs offer considerably more service in terms of guidance, remedial education, placement and job coaching.

Data suggests overlap in occupational offerings between educational institutions and the manpower agencies. In most cases, however, schools currently do not have the broad range of services required to keep the manpower participants in skill training programs until they acquire marketable skills.

A Comparative Study of Proprietary and Non-Proprietary Vocational Training Programs

A study of 51 proprietary and 14 non-proprietary schools in four cities examined student outcomes in four occupational areas; office, health, computer and technical occupations. About 7,000 students and 5,200 alumni were queried.

Findings indicate that 78 percent of the graduates sought training-related jobs and three-quarters of these persons found training-related jobs. However, less than 20% of the proprietary alumni and only 13% of the non-proprietary alumni obtained jobs through school placement service, a surprising result especially for proprietary schools, since virtually all offer placement assistance. Most graduates indicated satisfaction with their current job status. Of those alumni currently employed, about 34% of the proprietary and 12% of the non-proprietary group felt that the training was definitely not worth the money.

Cost-benefit measuresindicate that the investment in vocational training was well worthwhile for all occupational groups except the computer trainees in proprietary schools. Non-proprietary school graduates have an advantage over proprietary school graduates in cost-benefit measures and in salary gain from before training to the first job in training. However, non-proprietary alumni overall earned less before training than proprietary graduates. Proprietary and non-proprietary schools differ substantially in their operations and program offerings; however, the students enrolled in both types of schools are very similar in terms of backgrounds and motivational characteristics. Most are young high school graduates enrolled in full-time programs with a goal of obtaining full-time jobs. A sizeable proportion of the students (30% proprietary and, 42% non-proprietary) belong to minority ethnic groups. Accredited schools and chain schools surveyed are no more effective in placing graduates than non-accredited and non-chain schools. Cities surveyed include: Chicago, Illinois; Atlanta, Georgia; San Francisco, California; and Rochester, New York.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The National Longitudinal Survey of the Class of 1972 should provide the major source for outcome data for vocational students. Baseline data will be available in 1973; follow-up interviews are planned for fall 1973 and for intervals thereafter. Studies to be completed during 1973 include:

(a) Evaluation of Work Education Programs which meet Career Development Objectives. This study is described under Part G programs.

(b) Assessment of Career Guidance Counseling and Placement. This study will provide a thorough literature review of the effectiveness and availability of services to noncollege-bound students. Case studies of 15 exemplary programs and practices are included.

(c) Additional data from Project METRO, a study of vocational graduates in 25 major cities and a sample of their surburban communities with emphasis on comparing success of graduates and dropouts from vocational programs with non-vocational students will be completed next year.

Studies to be funded during 1973 include: An Assessment of Exemplary Programs funded under Part D. This study will assess the impact of the exemplary programs as demonstration sites for bringing about educational change and will examine the impact of the programs on student attitudes, behavior and placement.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

The Vocational Impact Study: Policy Issues and Analytical Problems in Evaluating Vocational Education: A Study of the State Grant Mechanism; and A Study of Duplication, Gaps, and Coordination of Publicly Funded Skill Training Programs in 20 Cities. National Planning Association, October 1972.

A Comparative Study of Proprietary and Non-Proprietary Vocational Training Programs. American Institutes for Research, November 1972.

National Longitudinal Surveys, Survey of Work Experience of Males, 14-24, 1966, and Survey of Work Experience of Young Men, 1968, Center for Human Resources Research, Ohio State University, and U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of Census, 1966 and 1968, often referred to as the Parnes Study.

A Cost Effective Study of Vocational Education: A Comparison of Vocational and nonvocational Education in Secondary Schools, Pennsylvania State University, 1969.

The Effectiveness of Vocational and Technical Education, Center for Vocational and Technical Education, University of Wisconsin, 1971.

Trends in Vocational Education, USOE, June 1970.

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

Reports from State Advisory Committees

Reports from the National Advisory Committee

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Program for Students with Special Needs

Legislation:

Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended 1968, Part A, Section 102 (b)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY:	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1969	$40,000,000	-0-
	1970	40,000,000	$20,000,000
	1971	50,000,000	20,000,000
	1972	60,000,000	20,000,000
	1973	60,000,000	20,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Grants are allocated to the States by formula, with no matching required, to assist in providing support for programs and services for persons who are unable to succeed in regular vocational programs because of poor academic background, lack of motivation, and/or depressing environmental factors. Programs are concentrated within the States in communities where there is a high incidence of youth unemployment and high school dropouts. Special services and programs are provided these youth and adults to encourage them to stay in school to acquire the academic and occupational skills needed for successful employment or to continue to pursue their career preparation.

Special services provided include specially trained teachers in remedial and bilingual specialities, staff aides, additional counseling services, facilities accessible to a high concentration of these students, and instructional materials and equipment best suited to their understanding and abilities.

Some of the areas where these funds have been expended are those where English is a second language, rural depressed communities, low-cost housing in the inner city, correctional institutions, and off-reservation locations with a predominance of American Indians.

Program data indicate increasing numbers are served; however, there is no clear measure of the quality of the services and programs provided or of the impact on the disadvantaged. A total of 152,778 students were enrolled under Section 102 (b) in fiscal year 1971 and about 200,000 in fiscal year 1972.

Each State has developed its own guidelines and plans for working either with other State agencies such as Correctional and Welfare in developing programs for those with academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps which prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Additional information about the extent to which disadvantaged students are served are cited in the review of the Impact Study, described under Part B.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Research and Training

Legislation:

Vocational Education Act of 1963,
as amended 1968, Part C

Expiration Date:

Permanent

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$11,850,000	$11,850,000
	1966	17,750,000	17,750,000
	1967	22,500,000	10,000,000
	1968	22,500,000	13,550,000
	1969	35,500,000	11,550,000
	1970	56,000,000	1,100,000
	1971	67,500,000	35,750,000
	1972	67,500,000	18,000,000
	1973	67,500,000	18,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

From fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1969, all the research funds under the Vocational Education Act were reserved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education for direct Federal grants and contracts. This arrangement was modified by Part C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, which provided for a division of the research funds between the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the State Boards for Vocational Education. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, which took affect in fiscal year 1970, provide the authority under which the Vocational Research Program is now operated.

Part C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 authorizes grants and contracts for research; for training programs to familiarize personnel with research results and products; developmental, experimental, or pilot programs designed to meet the special vocational needs of youths, especially disadvantaged youths; demonstration and dissemination projects; and to support the establishment and operation of State Research Coordinating Units (RCU's). The RCU is the officially designated unit located in the State Department of Education or in a State university which administers the State's vocational research programs and disseminates research findings to assist administrators, teachers and counselors, and teacher educators.

State reports indicate that the RCU's in many States promote and assist in adoption of practices and programs developed elsewhere. Many RCU's now operate extensive information retrieval and dissemination systems, linked to and based on the ERIC system, and others are in the process of developing such systems. Other RCU functions have included their performance of Statewide evaluation, as well as evaluation studies for local districts. The RCU's assist the States in planning efforts and frequently are assigned to coordinate the State-administered Exemplary projects under part D of the Vocational Education Act. In fiscal year 1972, about 25 percent of the State-administered funds were utilized for maintenance of the Research Coordinating Units, with approximately 75 percent being used for grants and contracts.

From reports on State research projects and studies, funds under Part C supported approximately 250 grants or contracts in fiscal year 1972. Priority areas receiving attention were: career education; problems of disadvantaged students; cost-effectiveness and cost-benetfir of programs and services; improvement of State and local administration of vocational education; program and system evaluation; new and emerging occupational areas; vocational guidance; follow-up studies of graduates, and employment needs of specific communities.

During fiscal year 1973, it is estimated that States will use about $2.5 million for the maintenance of RCU's and about $6.5 millions will support approximately 130 field-initiated projects, including some projects continued from fiscal year 1972. At least half of the projects will continue R&D work on various aspects of career education.

In fiscal year 1972, the 50 percent of the research funding reserved for discretionary use by the U.S. Commissioner of Education was concentrated on career education. The Commissioner's discretionary research funds were awarded to the States, on the population formula basis, to enable each State to establish a demonstration, testing, and development site for career education model programs.

In fiscal year 1973, the U.S. Commissioner's discretionary research funds were againused for grants to the State, to enable each State to continue with the development, testing, and demonstration of career education model programs, to engage in adaptive curriculum development for tailoring to their own conditions the curriculum materials emerging from various Federal and State career education efforts, and to begin the diffusion of tested career education components to other school districts. It is expected that by the end of fiscal year 1973, the refinement and diffusion of model programs of career education will be well underway in all States as a result of this effort.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of this program has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Each of the individual Federally-administered discretionary projects is required by Federal Regulations to have an independent evaluation by a third-party agency. The State-administered research projects and the State RCU's are evaluated by the State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education as a part of their overall responsibility for evaluating all programs covered by the State Plan for Vocational Education. In addition, some special in-depth evaluation studies have been commissioned by the States themselves. For example, the American Management Center, Inc. has just completed a study entitled "An Assessment of the Impact of Vocational Education Research and Related Projects on Educational Practice in Pennsylvania Since 1966." Tadlock Associates, Inc. is in the final stages of a study entitled "The Review and Assessment of the Change and Impact on Occupational Education Resulting from Research and Development Activities Supported by the State Division of Vocational and Technical Education of Illinois."

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State-Advisory Council Reports

Composite Evaluation Report for Occupational Education in the State of Illinois Fiscal Year 1972 (Division of Vocational-Technical Education-Illinois)

An Assessment of the Impact of Vocational Education Research and Related Projects on Educational Practice in Pennsylvania Since 1966 (American Management Center, Inc.)

Third-party Evaluator's Reports on Discretionary Projects

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education--Exemplary Programs

Legislation:

Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended 1968, Part D

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$15,000,000	$ -0-
	1970	57,500,000	13,000,000
	1971	75,000,000	16,000,000
	1972	75,000,000	16,000,000
	1973	75,000,000	16,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are awarded to the States for the purpose of stimulating new ways to create a bridge between school and earning a living for young people, who:

(a) are still in school,
(b) have left school either by graduation or by dropping out, or
(c) are in postsecondary programs of vocational preparation.

Other purposes are the promotion of cooperation between public education and manpower agencies, and the broadening of occupational aspirations and opportunities for youths, with special emphasis on youths who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps.

Fifty percent of each State's allotment is for use by the State Board for Vocational Education, and the remaining 50 percent is reserved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education for discretionary project grants or contracts within the State. Funds reserved by the Commissioner are available until expended and funds allotted to State Boards are available for obligation for two fiscal years. No matching is required.

The Federally-administered discretionary projects are distributed geographically across the States, as required by Law, with at least one project in operation in each State. The typical project is funded at a level of about $130,000 per year for a three-year period. The funds appropriated in fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 supported the first three-year cycle of projects. The FY 1973 funds are being used to initiate a new three-year cycle, with at least one new project being initiated in each State.

The Federally-administered discretionary projects have been major contributors to the National thrust in career education. The career education techniques and instructional materials emerging from the first three-year cycle of Part D discretionary projects provided input to the design and development of the National Institute of Education's School-Based Career Education Model. These same techniques and materials represented input into the pilot career education projects initiated in FY 1971 with discretionary funds from Part C of the Vocational Education Act. They have also served as a resource for a variety of State-initiated pilot projects in career education. The experience, the techniques, and the instructional materials derived from the first three-year cycle of Part D discretionary projects have provided input for the current movement in career education.

In addition to serving as a source of techniques and materials for career education, these discretionary Part D projects have served an important role as demonstration sites, within each State, to provide practical, operational examples of career education functioning in local settings. Several specific projects serve as examples:

State-administered Part D projects are in operation in all States, utilizing the 50 percent of the Part D funding which is allotted to the State Boards for Vocational Education. In FY 1972, 300 State-administered Part D projects were in operation, many of which represented continuations of projects initiated in FY 1970 or FY 1971. About 175 of these projects were focused on various aspects and components of career education. In FY 1973, it is anticipated that the States will be funding from 225 to 300 State-administered Part D projects, with about 175 to 200 of these focused on the career education concept.

In a number of States, such as Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Georgia, Mississippi, Wyoming, and Oregon, a systematic Statewide plan has been formulated for the development and diffusion of career education. These plans frequently provide for Statewide coordination through the State Research Coordinating Unit (RCU), which is supported under Part C of the Vocational Education Act. These Statewide plans generally use the discretionary Part D project as a focal point for career education model-building. The plan then involves diffusion of tested career education components to other school districts throughout the State utilizing State-administered Part D and Part C funds as well as funds from other sources (such as the Appalachian Regional Commission) to assist school districts in adapting and implementing the career education programs.

Program Effectiveness:

Most of the projects funded under Part D are only in their third year and no formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

As assessment of Exemplary programs funded under Part D is scheduled to begin in the spring of 1973. Results of the series of small project studies required by Federal regulations will be available to provide basic data from which to draw a sample of existing programs. The study will include programs funded with and without Part D money within the same States to evaluate data on institutions, programs, students, and community involvement. The objecitves of the study includes an assessment of the impact of the exemplary programs as demonstration sites for bringing about educational change and to determine the impact of the exemplary programs on student attitudes, behavior, and placement.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Reports
State Advisory Council Reports
Third-party Evaluator's Reports on Discretionary Projects (Preliminary)

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Consumer and Homemaking Education

Legislation:

Vocational Education Act of 1963,
as amended in 1968, Part F

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969		
	1970	$ 25,000,000	$ 15,000,000
	1971	35,000,000	21,250,000
	1972	50,000,000	25,625,000
	1973	50,000,000	25,625,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are allocated to the States to assist them in preparation of youth and adults for the role of homemaker or to contribute to the employability of such youths and adults in the dual role of homemaker and wage earner. Programs are conducted in consumer education, nutrition, child care and guidance, interpersonal and family relationships, improvement of home environment, budgeting and management of resources. At least one-third of these funds must be used in economically depressed areas or areas with high rates of unemployment. Matching is 50/50 except for programs in economically depressed areas where the Federal share may reach 90 percent. Part F, Consumer and Homemaking Education, is distinguished from other parts of the law since it is not defined as vocational education for gainful employment; occupational home economics programs are funded under Part B of the law.

The total enrollment in consumer and homemaking education increased from 2.4 million in fiscal year 1970 to 2.9 million in fiscal year 1971, a 20 per cent increase. Estimated enrollment for fiscal year 1972 is 3.2 million In response to the legislation to channel at least one third of the Federal funds to depressed areas, the number of individuals served rose from 227,972 in fiscal year 1970 to 776,763 in fiscal year 1971.

Many of those enrolled in the programs received some topics on consumer education; in a few States, all students are being required to take such courses before program completion. In Georgia all postsecondary area school students are required to include a Consumer and Family Life Skills Course in their programs. In Illinois, every high school student is required to take consumer education, and in Ohio, schools are responding to the State resolution to establish consumer education in grades K through 12. For the most part, however, these courses are either not encouraging or not permitting men to enroll. For fiscal year 1971, less than 7 percent of the Part F enrollments were male.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of this program has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

Reports Submitted by State Supervisors of Home Economics

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Cooperative Vocational Education Programs

Legislation:

VEA of 1963, as amended 1968, Part G

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$20,000,000	-0-
	1970	35,000,000	$14,000,000
	1971	50,000,000	18,500,000
	1972	75,000,000	19,500,000
	1973	75,000,000	19,500,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States to support cooperative education programs which involve arrangements between schools and employers, enabling students to receive vocational instruction in the school and related on-the-job training through part-time employment. Priority is given to areas where there is high incidence of student dropouts and youth unemployment. Students must be at least 14 years old and are paid by the employer either a minimum wage or a student-learner rate established by the Department of Labor. Federal support may cover program operation, added training costs to employers, payment for services or unusual costs to students while in training, and ancillary services. Federal funds may be used for all or part of a State's expenditure for programs authorized and approved under State Plan provisions.

Part G cooperative vocational education programs have extended the range of occupations for which training can be offered, such as marketing and distribution, business and office, trade and industrial, and health occupations. In addition there was an emphasis on developing cooperative education programs for small communities which cut across several occupational fields in one program setting. Students could prepare for specific areas of gainful employment which were not available previously because of insufficient enrollment or lack of facilities to support specialized vocational programs. Most of the new programs were developed in areas with high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment.

Part G programs were also provided in the earlier grades to facilitate exploration and development of general work attitudes and skills.

To involve more disadvantaged youth in fiscal year 1973, increased emphasis will be given to the implementation of special provisions under Part G which permit the reimbursement to employers for certain added costs incurred in providing on-th-job training and the payment of unusual costs associated with student participation in the program.

One indication of acceptance is the large expansion in cooperative enrollments within the past few years. Part G cooperative enrollments in fiscal year 1971 showed a three-fold increase over fiscal year 1970, from 23,000 to 70,469. For fiscal year 1972, some 97,500 students were enrolled in Part G programs. Cooperative vocational education supported under the Basic State Grant Program (Part B) has also increased, from 309,371 in fiscal year 1971 to 355,400 in fiscal year 1972.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness have yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In an Office of Education funded study scheduled for completion in May 1973, twelve school districts in Minnesota, North Carolina, and Ohio (offering both cooperative and non-cooperative vocational education programs) are being examined to (1) identify types of cooperative vocational education programs being conducted, (2) compare the costs of vocational education programs with and without a cooperative component, and (3)determine, insofar as possible, the effectiveness of the programs and extent to which target populations are served.

The Office of Education has also undertaken a study called, An Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs, due to be completed in September 1973. The purpose of the study is to evaluate existing programs on both the secondary and postsecondary level to determine successful program components, to delimit constraints on program expansion, and to examine incentives to increase employer participation. To date some 500 work-education programs have been recommended for inclusion in the study, as being successful, promising, and worthy of replication in other locations. Descriptions of these programs will appear in a directory due to be published in May. Some 60 percent of the programs are cooperative vocational education; 20 percent are work study and the remainder are familiarization and career awareness programs. Fifty of these programs will be studied intensively in the Spring of 1973 to examine administrative and organizational designs, tie-ins with employers and unions, and characteristics of students enrolled in these work experience programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Committee Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Work Study Programs

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
VEA of 1963, as amended 1968 Part H, extended by P.L. 91-230 and P.L. 92-318	June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$30,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	1966	50,000,000	25,000,000
	1967	35,000,000	10,000,000
	1968	35,000,000	10,000,000
	1969	35,000,000	-0-
	1970	35,000,000	4,250,000
	1971	45,000,000	5,500,000
	1972	55,000,000	6,000,000
	1973	55,000,000	6,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are allocated to the States for work-study programs to assist economically disadvantaged full-time vocational educational students, ages 15-20, to remain in school by providing part-time employment with public employers. Priority is given to areas of high school dropout rates and youth unemployment. Funds are used for the administration of the program and for compensation of students by the local educational agencies or other public agencies or institutions. Matching is 80 percent Federal and 20 percent State and local.

Work study is essentially an income maintenance program for the economically deprived youth who are in school. Only about 2 percent of the Federal funds is used for administration; nearly all funds, about 98 percent go directly to needy students in the form of wages for a public service job.

The work study program is in line with the career education objective of preparing every individual with a marketable skill or for further education. Students provided financial assistance are the economically disadvantaged who are apt to drop out of school before obtaining sufficient job skills for economic independence. Retention of these students in school opens numerous additional options for the student in employment and further education.

Vocational work study was first authorized in the Vocational Eudcation Act of 1963. The cumulative enrollment since then has been nearly 250,000 students. Some 28,726 secondary and postsecondary students were served in fiscal year 1971; in 1972, the number increased to 31,300.

While the primary purpose of the work study program is to provide financial support, reports from the States reveal that other gains accrue, such as efforts to find employment in areas related to the vocational instruction. Typical postitions held by work-study students included: food service worker, clerk-typist, hospital aide, printing assistant, drafting assistant, furniture repairman, and appliance repairman.

Most of the recipients are secondary students. Since compensation cannot exceed $45 a month, most postsecondary students must look elsewhere for the financial support they need. Legislation was proposed but not passed that would have increased the level of compensation for students to at least the Department of Labor student/learner rate (75 percent of the minimum wage). Some States, such as Wisconsin, are coordinating student aid programs on the post-secondary level, but this has not become a standard practice elsewhere.

The total resources for work-study are limited when compared to the number of economically disadvantaged youth in school. In Idaho, for example, the State's Part H allotment was $23,000 in fiscal year 1972. With these funds, projects in only 5 high schools and 4 postsecondary area vocational schools were undertaken. Within those schools only 70 high school students and 93 postsecondary students were served.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal appraisals of program effectiveness have yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In June of 1972, the Office of Education undertook a study entitled, An Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs (see description under Ongoing Studies in Cooperative Vocational Education). A preliminary tally of the programs recommended for inclusion indicates that about 20 percent are work-study programs. In May, 1973 all of the 500 programs described as being particularly successful or innovative are scheduled to appear in a directory. Intensive study of 50 of these programs through interviews with administrators, employers, unions and students will identify successful program components and constraints operating in these programs as well as possible incentives to expand employer participation. The study is due to be completed in September 1973.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Curriculum Development

Legislation:

VEA of 1963, as amended, Part I

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$7,000,000	-0-
	1970	10,000,000	$ 880,000
	1971	10,000,000	4,000,000
	1972	10,000,000	3,981,000
	1973	10,000,000	4,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operations:

The program provides assistance to State and local educational agencies in the improvement, development, dissemination, and evaluation and adoption of vocational education curricula and curriculum materials for use in teaching occupational subjects, including curricula for new and changing occupational fields and training of personnel in vocational curriculum development. Part I authorizes grants to or contracts with colleges or universities, State boards, and other public or non-profit private agencies and institutions, or contracts with public or private agencies, organizations or institutions. No matching of funds is required.

Program Effectiveness:

Program effectiveness can be judged in part by the number of curricula developed and by the extent the curricula and curriculum materials are adopted and used by State and local educational agencies. No funds have been obligated for the printing of these materials.

Nineteen curriculum projects were funded in FY 70, the first year of funding. Twenty projects were provided funding support in FY 71, and thirty-three projects received funding support in FY 72.

Sixteen of the twenty projects provided funding support during FY 71 were directed toward specific aspects of career education. Of the 16, nine focused on the development of nine job cluster curricula at various grade levels of career education. Seven other projects focused on career development in emerging fields such as computer sciences, environmental control, and transportation.

Fiscal year 1972 funds supported a variety of activities from operational support for five State curriculum laboratories (in Illinois, Kentucky, Oklahoma, California and Mississippi) and training institutes to "State of the Art" papers on the extent of curriculum development in particular fields or for special target populations, and to the development of specific curriculum materials.

Eight projects funded in FY 72 focused on the development of curricula for specific employment areas such as agri-business; recreation, hospitality, and tourism occupations; business ownership; concrete technology; bio-medical equipment technology; and technical career education.

Another five projects funded in fiscal year 1972 were concerned with developing career awareness curricula, including one curriculum for Spanish surnamed people and a television program for three-to six-year-olds on broadening vocational self concepts. The five projects together covered the age range from pre-school to adult.

The remaining projects dealt with consumer education curricula and with sponsoring conferences and training institutes for curriculum personnel development.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education - Grants to States

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
(Title III, P.L. 91-230)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	Authorized under EOA	$18,612,000
	1966	Authorized under EOA	19,689,063
	1967	$40,000,000	26,280,000
	1968	60,000,000	32,200,000
	1969	70,000,000	36,000,000
	1970	160,000,000	40,000,000
	1971	200,000,000	44,875,000
	1972	225,000,000	51,134,000
	1973	225,000,000	51,300,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States for the purpose of eliminating functional illiteracy among the Nation's adults by expanding educational opportunities and encouraging programs that will enable adults 16 years of age and older to continue their education to enable them to become more employable, productive and responsible citizens.

Providing adult basic education is emphasized for those adults with less than an eighth grade level of education since the law states that special emphasis be given adult basic education programs except where such needs can be shown to have been met in the State. Local school districts participate by submitting proposals and plans to the State education agency. Matching requirements are a minimum of 10 percent of total cost by the States and local education agencies and 90 percent Federal funds. States that have met the need for adult basic education in a particular school district or geographic area can expend up to 20% of their federal State grant for adult education leading to a high school equivalency degree.

Approximately 691,000 adults were enrolled in fiscal year 1972, an increase of about 85,000 or 14 percent over fiscal year 1971. States reported that more than 100,000 of the enrollees completed the eighth grade and about 80 percent were in the priority target group between 18 and 44 years of age. Federal costs per student averaged about $75.

ABE programs extend services to many target populations. In fiscal year 1971, the last year data are currently available, about 18 percent of the participants were enrolled in English as a second language (ESL) classes and 12 percent of the enrollees were institutionalized in mental hospitals, prisons or other facilities.

Program Effectiveness:

In June of 1971 the Office of Education began a longitudinal evaluation of the adult basic education program. A national sample of Adult Basic Education students was developed excluding students who were institutionalized, were migrants, or were over 44 years old. Students in programs primarily designed for high school work above the 8th grade were also excluded from the scope of the study, as were students in ESL (English as a Second Language) programs. Students in the sample have been interviewed and tested, and information was collected on the programs and classes the students were enrolled in. During the next year, follow-up interviews with students will obtain information on employment and personal changes which may be related to enrollment in Adult Basic Education.

Data presently available are derived from the student interviews conducted in February 1972. Program and class data have not yet been analyzed.

More than half the students have completed 9 grades or more of schooling, although they are now enrolled for studies designed primarily for the 8th grade level and below. About 15% have high school diplomas or certificates, and a few have attended college. Stated educational goals are high -- all but a few think they will try for a high school credential, and more than half think they will attend college some time. About 70% intend to enroll for additional vocational or technical training.

Program participants were administered basic skills tests (TABE) early in 1972 and again four or five months later. Grade level on the initial reading test was 5.4; initial math test, 6.4. The average grade level gain between reading tests was .5, and .3 between math tests. The percentage of students gaining a full grade or more was 26 percent for reading and 20 percent for mathematics. The median number of hours of instruction between tests was 66.

Some 55 percent of the students work. For those employed, median income is $300 a month, but there are wide variations both above and below the median. Only about one-quarter of the students receive welfare or public assistance. Less than 20% have had serious problems in finding jobs, and almost all who are employed feel fairly secure. Most of those who are not employed believe that when they have completed the basic education program, their chances of finding a job will be significantly improved.

Nearly one-quarter of the students interviewed had started the program before 1971; a good number have been attending for several years. Almost all (85%) of the students expect to attend class every time or most of the time in the future. Motivation for coming is primarily educational rather than job-related. Main interests are reading and working with numbers, with comparatively small interest in writing as a separate subject for learning. And finally, only a small percent of presently enrolled students believe that adults object to attending basic education classes in an elementary or high school building.

More than half of the State education agencies are contracting for independent evaluations of the adult education program.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Longitudinal Study of Adult Basic Education - System Development Corporation - due to be completed September, 1973.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual Program Reports from the States

Selected Merit Award Programs identified by Regional Offices

Interim Report #1, Data on Selected Students in Adult Basic Education Programs, 1971-72, September 1972, System Development Corporation.

Interim Report #2, Test Data on Adult Basic Education Students, December 1972, System Development Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education - Special Projects

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
(Title III, P.L. 91-230, Section 309(b)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967	Section 304(a) provides that not less than 10 percent, nor more than 20 percent of total appropriation shall be reserved for purposes of Section 309.	$1,520,162
	1968		6,550,000
	1969		7,000,000
	1970		8,000,000
	1971		7,000,000
	1972		6,640,000
	1973		7,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Project grants are awarded to local educational agencies or other public or private nonprofit agencies, including educational television stations, for the purpose of experimentation with new teaching techniques, methods, programs, and with new operational and administrative systems to strengthen the ongoing State grant adult education program. Required matching is 10% of the cost of the project wherever feasible.

Priorities are developed on an annual basis to assure support of the Commissioner's objectives. The special project authority provides the Commissioner an opportunity to experiment and develop new programs and adult education systems to discover more effective means of motivating and teaching the undereducated. Projects have been selected that focus on the unique needs of bi-cultural groups who need to learn English as a second language. Projects of national significance are funded that are beyond the scope of a local school system. However, prior to awarding a grant the objectives of the project must be of such a nature that the results could be replicated by a local school system.

Special projects are generally developmental and experimental in design. In fiscal year 1972, 58 projects were funded, of which 22 were continuations.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of ABE special projects is planned to begin late in FY 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Evaluation Reports from Special Projects

Evaluation Reports from State Personnel

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education - Teacher Training

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
(Title III, P.L. 91-230, Section 309(c)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966	Authorization under EOA	$1,055,000
	1967		1,500,000
	1968	Section 301 of P.L. 91-230 which amended section 304(a) of the Adult Education Act provides that not less than [illegible] or more than 20% of total appropriation shall be reserved for the purposes of Section 309.	1,500,000
	1969		2,000,000
	1970		2,000,000
	1971		3,000,000
	1972		3,360,000
	1973		3,000,000 requested

Program Purpose and Operation:

Project grants are awarded to institutions of higher education, State or local educational agencies, or other public or private nonprofit agencies to promote and coordinate the training of personnel who work or are preparing to work in adult education. No matching funds are required. Expansion of the program is achieved through State and local workshops supported by State grant funds which provide preservice and inservice staff training and development for adult education personnel.

The available resources of this program have been used to emphasize coordination, to sensitize adult education personnel to the unique needs of adults and to introduce new materials and techniques for instruction.

A major redirection in the training of personnel for adult education programs was made in fiscal year 1971 with a shift of emphasis to regional planning and coordination of the teacher training programs, based on the program developed by the Southern Regional Education Board in Region IV.

The 1972 funds were focused on the development and adaptation of such programs in the other nine regions. These nine projects are directed toward regional adult education personnel needs and required a total of approximately $2,500,000 of adult education teacher training funds for the first year of funding. The projects will continue for three years, after which time they will be sustained by State and institutional funds. The remaining 1972 teacher training funds available (approximately $500,000) supported six additional teacher training grants.

All of the projects funded in fiscal year 1972 are directed toward the adult education teacher training objectives which will include training teachers to teach paraprofessionals who in turn will provide individualized instruction to undereducate adults; the development of adult education personnel for ethnic and special population groups; and the training of surplus elementary and secondary teachers to become adult education personnel.

In addition to the continuation of the Regional Staff Development Models, 1973 teacher-training priorities will include preparing personnel for career-based adult education programs in correctional institutions, an adult education center for cultural and ethnic understanding and a center for resource development in adult education.

Emphasis will be given toward training bilingual teachers for special population groups who need to learn English as a second language and recruiting surplus elementary and secondary teachers to retrain as adult education personnel.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Information:

Evaluation Reports from State Personnel

Reports from Training Institutions

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA)

Legislation:

Manpower Development and Training
Act of 1962

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

(Appropriations for MDTA)
(are made to the Department)
(of Labor. Funds are transferred)
(to DHEW for institutional)
(training.)

Total Federal obligations for institutional training including allowances paid trainee:

1965	$249,348,000
1966	281,710,000
1967	215,588,000
1968	221,847,000
1969	213,505,000
1970	256,071,000
1971	276,767,000
1972	355,407,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor jointly administer programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act. These programs are aimed at reducing the level of unemployment, offsetting skill shortages, and enhancing the skills and productivity of the Nation's work force. The major tool used is education and training of those who are out of a job or are working at less than their full potential.

Under the Act the Secretary of Labor must assess the need for training, select the trainees, provide allowances and other training benefits, and help trainees get jobs. He is also responsible for job-development programs and experimental and demonstration projects, and for working with employers to develop on-the-job training (OJT).

Contracting for institutional training is a responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Institutional training, carried on in classrooms, shops, and laboratories, focuses primarily on skill training. It also includes the basic literacy, improved communication and computation skills, counseling, and preemployment orientation needed to make the enrollee employable.

Institutional training coupled with OJT projects is a further responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as is institutional training offered to residents of redevelopment areas, communities which are severely depressed economically and the instructional aspects of experimental and demonstration projects, as well as MDTA training in correctional institutions.

Most training programs are operated through State agreements. Training is provided through public educational agencies or private institutions. The State Agency is paid not more than 90% of the cost to the State for carrying out the agreement.

MDTA trainees are out-of-school unemployed or underemployed persons -- in fiscal year 1972 over 66% were considered to be seriously disadvantaged, almost 3/4 had been unemployed over 15 weeks during the past year, 42 percent had not finished high school, 39 percent belonged to a minority race, 38 percent were under age 22, 8 percent were over 44 and 12 percent were handicapped.

Since the beginning of the MDTA program in August of 1962, 1,284,600 persons have been enrolled in the institutional training program, 75 percent completed their training objective and 75 percent of those completing secured employment. Part of the remaining 25 percent were called into the armed forces, some returned to full-time school, and others withdrew from the labor force.

In fiscal year 1972, 111,400 trainees completed institutional training and 81,500 (73 percent) had secured employment and were still on the job when last contacted.

First time enrollments:		
	1963	32,000
	1964	68,600
	1965	145,300
	1966	177,500
	1967	150,000
	1968	140,000
	1969	135,000
	1970	130,000
	1971	155,600
	1972	150,600

Training has been conducted in over 300 different occupational skills ranging from accounting clerk to x-ray technician. Clerical occupations comprise the largest group, almost 10 percent of the total enrollments.

Program Effectiveness:

The MDTA institutional training program appears to be generally effective in providing training and services to unemployed and underemployed adults according to national data and a series of evaluation studies jointly developed and administered by the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Labor.

MDTA Outcomes Study:

This retrospective study of 5,169 former MDTA participants who exited the program in 1969 attempts to answer: "What difference does MDTA make to the employment and earnings of those who enroll?" Median gain in annual income following participation in MDTA for those with at least one post-training job was $1,876 for institutional enrollees and $1,614 for those on-the-job (OJT). Increases in annual income measured during the post-training period stemmed from a combination of: (a) higher wages, (b) improved employment stability, and (c) increased labor force participation.

However, using the 1969 Office of Economic Opportunity poverty criteria (approximately $4,000 for a family of four) as an illustration, the average non-disadvantaged family was above the poverty line before as well as after training. Disadvantaged enrollees were well within the poverty ranks before training. Following training, the median income for disadvantaged institutonal enrollees was raised about $1210, and 27 percent of this group did raise their income above $4,000.

Within institutional groups, annual income gains vary significantly by personal and household characteristics as well as by type and duration of training experience. Among those groups who made significant gains are: the disadvantaged, completers, those trained in skilled occupations, particularly construction trades and health fields. Spanish-American enrollees realized, on the average, greater gains in annual income than white or black enrollees. The longer the training period was, the higher the average annual income gain.

An 83% recovery rate was attained in this study involving personal interviews with a random sample of persons approximately 18 months after they exited training.

Evaluation of MDTA Institutional Individual Referral Program:

About 65 percent of those who enroll under the individual referral system complete their training and of these about 48 percent were reported as placed. Public schools have a slightly higher completion rate (67 percent) than private schools (63 percent). Although dropout rates usually increase with increases in length of training, public schools show both a longer length of training and a higher completion rate than private schools.

Public schools show a much higher rate (51 percent) than private schools (36 percent). The major reason for the relatively low placement rates was judged to be incomplete records.

Of all placements recorded, 79 percent are in training-related jobs. Follow-up information indicate that 70 percent of the trainees are placed in jobs three to six months have training completion. Follow-up data indicates the lack of reliability of data on immediate placement. The private school follow-up rate is 71 percent, 1 percent higher than that of public schools.

Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Institutional Manpower Training in Meeting Employers' Needs in Skills Shortage Occupations:

No significant impact upon skills shortages can be identified because MDTA's limited training duration (in practice about 26 weeks) precludes training for higher skills, the report indicates.

A major finding of this report is that no system exists for defining or identifying skills shortage occupations at the local level, despite the introduction of computerized data gathering systems, the existence of a national industrial matrix, the methodologies for forecasting national occupational needs, and other valid sources of information.

The report questions whether the entire field of occupational information is adequate at local or regional levels--adequate not just for MDTA but for vocational education, junior and community colleges, and those charged with the public function of helping the unemployed find employment.

Over 100 demanded occupations for which MDTA training could have been provided legally but for which training would have required a longer period at a higher per trainee cost that are allowable under current practices were identified. Most institutional programs are for occupations in which turnover rates are high, or for which there is a relatively continuous and persistend demand, such as for clerical workers, welders, workers in the health field, auto mechanics and auto body repairmen.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A study of Basic Education programs conducted under MDTA institutional training programs will be completed early in 1973. A small comparative study of MDTA Institutional Training in different types of institutions, also to be completed early in 1973, should provide a model for further cost analyses. An Evaluation of the Impact of MDTA on women will begin early in 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

A series of evaluation studies of the MDTA Institutional Training Program have been jointly developed and administered by the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Labor. These include:

1) Manpower Development and Training Act Outcomes Study. Decision Making Information, April 1972.

2) Effectiveness in Institutional Manpower Training in Meeting Employers Needs in Skills Shortage Occupations. Olympus Research Corporation, May 1972.

3) A Study of Individual Referrals under MDTA. Olympus Research Corporation, June 1972.

4) Evaluation of the Relevance and Quality of Preparation under the MDTA Institutional Training Program. Mentec Corporation, May 1971.

5) Evaluation of Manpower Development and Training Skills Centers. Olympus Research Corporation, February 1971.

6) An Analysis and Evaluation of MDTA Institutional Programs Systems and Practices. North American Rockwell Information Systems Company, April 1971.

Other Sources of Information:

Annual State Evaluation Reports

Annual Manpower Report of the Secretary of HEW to the Congress, 1963 to 1971, "Education and Training..."

"A National Attitude Study of Trainees in MDTA Institutional Programs" Gerald Gurin, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, August 1971.

Manpower Report of the President, annual 1963 to 1972.

D. Higher Education Programs

1. Educational Opportunity Grants Program
2. College Work-Study Program
3. Cooperative Education Program
4. Guaranteed Student Loan Program
5. National Defense Student Loan Program
6. Upward Bound Program
7. Educational Talent Search Program
8. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students
9. Strengthening Developing Institutions
10. Annual Interest Grants
11. Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities
12. State Administration and Planning
13. Foreign Language and Areas Centers, Research and Studies
14. Fulbright-Hays Act
15. Community Service and Continuing Education Program
16. Land Grant Colleges and Universities
17. NDEA Fellowship Programs
18. EPDA, Part E Fellowships
19. EPDA, Part E Institutes
20. Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Oppertunity Grants Program*

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, 79 Stat. 1231; P.L. 89-329; as amended by P.L. 90-575, Title I, 82 Stat. 1017; and as amendee by P.L. 91-95, 83 Stat. 143.	June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization**	Appropriation***
1966	$ 70,000,000	$ 58,000,000
1967	70,000,000	112,000,000 1/
1968	70,000,000	140,600,000 2/
1969	70,000,000	124,600,000
1970	125,000,000	164,600,000
1971	170,000,000	167,700,000
1972	170,000,000	220,300,000 3/
1973	200,000,000	210,300,000

* This program has been replaced in the Education Amendments of 1972 by the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program and the Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants program.

** Plus such sums as may be necessary for other than initial year awards

*** Fiscal Year appropriation for use in succeeding Fiscal Year

1/ This appropriation was reduced by $1.8 million by the President's Cost Reduction Order.

2/ This appropriation was reduced by $9 million by Cost Reduction Order.

3/ $10 million of this appropriation was "borrowed" for use in FY 1972.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide, through institutions of higher education, educational opportunity grants to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means of their own or of their families would be unable to obtain the benefits of higher education without such aid.

The Educational Opportunity Grants program (EOG) is implemented through allocations to participating institutions which award the monies to needy students. Allotments to States are based on the number of full-time higher education students in a State compared with the total such enrollment in the United States. Students may receive EOG awards for up to $1,000 per year. However, every grant must be matched by the institution from some other aid administered by the institution including the Federal Work-Study program and National Defense Student Loans. Graduate students are not eligible for EOG support.

Office of Education strategy for this program is to encourage institutions of higher education to target these student aid funds to the most financially needy students, while providing these students with a financial aid package enabling them to complete their higher education.

During Academic Year 1972-73, the EOG program includes 2,300 participating institutions with an estimate of 303,500 students receiving grants. The average award per student during the year amounted to $670. For FY 72, panels approved $259,084,000 in institutional requests, as compared with funds available of $177,700,000.

The Education Amendments of 1972 replaced the EOG program with the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BOG) and Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants (SOG) programs. The BOG program entitles students in postsecondary education to basic grants of $1,400 less their family's contribution. These grants can not exceed one-half the cost of the student's attendance or 50 to 60 percent of the student's actual need, depending on the appropriation levels for the program. The SOG program, much like the current EOG program, provides grants to assist students further in obtaining a postsecondary education. Grants up to $1,500 are available or one-half the sum of all student aid provided by the institution to the student, whichever is lesser.

Program Effectiveness:

A recent evaluation of the EOG program conducted by the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University found the program to be achieving its primary goal of enabling students of exceptional financial need to obtain an education beyond high school. However, the evaluation also found that almost three-fifths of the institutions in the program reported that their EOG funding allocation for FY 1970 was inadequate. Seventy-two percent of the predominantly black schools, in which two-thirds of the students receive financial aid, reported inadequate funds. States which are funded at less than 70 percent of panel-approved requests had a disproportionately large share of schools in low income counties and public two-year institutions.

Recommendations in the final report completed by the Bureau of Applied Social Research included the following:

1. Modification of the State allocation formula to ensure channeling of funds to States with the greatest needs;
2. Immediate and substantial increase in the funding of the EOG program to meet the needs which have been generated by increasing numbers of schools in the program, reported increases in the number of low-income students entering college, and higher costs of attending college.

On-going and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None for EOG. A study is currently being designed to assess the impact of the new student financial aid programs on both students and institutions.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Applied Social Research, The Federal Educational Opportunity Grant Program, A Status Report, Fiscal Year 1970-71.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION

Program Name:

College Work-Study Program

Legislation:

P.L. 88-452, Title I, (42 U.S.C. 2751), 78 Stat. 515; as amended by P.L. 89-329, Title IV, 79 Stat. 1249; as amended by P.L. 90-515, Title I, 82 Stat. 1028-1029.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation*
1965	1/	$ 55,710,000
1966	$ 129,000,000	99,123,000
1967	165,000,000	134,100,000
1968	200,000,000	139,900,000
1969	225,000,000	139,900,000
1970	275,000,000	152,460,000
1971	320,000,000	158,400,000 2/
1972	320,000,000	426,600,000 3/
1973	360,000,000	270,200,000

* Up until FY 1972, the CWS Fiscal Year appropriation was used to fund program operations during the calendar year. With FY 1972, the program became one full year forward-funded.

1/ The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorized a lump sum of $412,500,000 for three youth programs including College Work-Study.

2/ Actual funds available for CWS in this year amounted to $199,700,000, including reprogrammed funds.

3/ Includes $244,600,000 forward funding for FY 1973, plus a supplemental of $25,600,000. A total of $237,400,000 was available for use during FY 1972 from a combination of FY 1971 and FY 1972 appropriations.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The main object of the College Work-Study program (CWS) is to promote the part-time employment of students, particularly those from low-income families. Employment may be made available only to those students who need earnings to pursue a course of study at an eligible college or university. Employment may be for the institution itself (except in the case of a proprietary institution of higher education), or for a public or private nonprofit organization. Students may work up to an average of fifteen hours per week during a semester or other term when their classes are in session. Employment during vacation periods, such as the summer, may be as high as 40 hours per week.

Grants are made to higher education institutions for partial reimbursement of wages paid to students. Since August, 1968, these Federal grants cover 80 percent of the student wages, with the remainder to be paid by the institution, the employer of the student, or some other donor.

Two percent of each year's appropriation is reserved for Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The rest is allotted among the 50 States and the District of Columbia on the basis of the number of each, compared with the total in all 51 states, of (a) full-time higher education students, (b) high school graduates, and (c) related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than $3,000. Allocations to institutions within a State are based on approved applications.

Office of Education strategy for this program is to encourage institutions of higher education to target these students aid funds to the most financially needy students, while providing these students with a financial aid package enabling them to complete their higher education.

The Education Amendments of 1972 changed certain sections of the College Work-Study program. These will slightly amend the State allotment formula, change the emphasis of the program to students with great financial need, and authorize the participation of half-time students in the program. These program changes will take effect in Academic Year 1973-74.

During Academic Year 1971-72, approximately 2,500 institutions of higher education participated in the CWS program enabling some 545,000 students to find part-time employment. The average annual student wage, including the institutional matching share, amounted to an estimated $525, per student. For FY 1972, panels approved $305,707,000 in institutional requests, as compared with $237,400,000 actually available for distribution to schools. During Academic Year 1972,73, approximately 592,000 students are participating in the program.

Program Effectiveness:

Preliminary indications from a study by the Bureau of Applied Social Research show that when compared with national (ACE) norms for entering freshmen, CWS freshmen constitute a group from a distinctly lower socio-economic background. These CWS students (studied during Academic Year 1970-71) have proportionatley almost three times as many students from minority backgrounds as the ACE group. Fifty-five percent of the CWS students that year came from families with annual incomes of less than $6,000. The study found that six out of ten institutions reported that their 1970-71 funding allocation was inadequate to provide employment for all eligible students.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The CWS program is under study by the Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University. The final report is due in February, 1973

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January, 1972

Bureau of Higher Education Data.

Preliminary data from CWS evaluation study.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Cooperative Education Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 90-575, Title I, 82 Stat. 1030, (20 U.S.C. 1087b) included in the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, Title IV, Part C	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	*	$ 1,540,000
	1971	*	1,600,000
	1972	$ 1,700,000	1,700,000
	1973	$10,750,000	10,750,000

* One percent of the College Work-Study appropriation was authorized to be used in support of cooperative education programs at higher education institutions.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Under this program, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to award grants for the planning, establishment, expansion or carrying out of cooperative education programs in higher education institutions. In addition, grants or contracts are authorized for the training of persons in the planning, establishment, administration, and coordination of such programs and research into methods of improving, developing, or promoting the use of cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education. Cooperative education is defined as alternate periods of full-time study and full-time public or private employment related to a student's academic course of study (or his career objectives).

The objective of the cooperative education program is to increase the number of opportunities for students at institutions to obtain career education. Federal support for such programs at colleges and universities is designed to encourage institutions which do not have such programs to determine the feasibility of establishing them. Other institutions which have planned for such programs and desire to implement them may use grant funds for this purpose, and those which plan to expand or strengthen existing programs may receive support.

Under the Cooperative Education program, grants are awarded to institutions on a proposal basis, with an institutions eligible to receive grants for three years. Awards cannot exceed $75,000 and funds must not be used as compensation for student employment. The student work experience must closely correlate with and enrich their on-campus experiences. Employers of students pay them commensurate with their productivity and the extent to which they are capable of assuming job responsibilities. In many instances the compensation students receive while employed is their major source of support in continuing and completing their academic programs. The institutions of higher education assume the responsibility for assigning the student to a job relevant to his academic program and providing supervision during the work period. In addition, the student's job performance is evaluated by the institution. In many cases academic credit is given for the work experience, and in others the kind and extent of work experience is recorded on the transcript. Salaries and other administrative expenses for cooperative education administrators are payable from grant funds.

In FY 1971, 91 institutions of higher education received grants totaling $1.6 million. Included are programs at institutions located in Appalachia and the inner-city ghettos as well as those addressing the special needs of veterans and the handicapped. In FY 1972, 91 institutions received grants totaling $1.7 million, with an average award of $18,681. These funds enabled approximately 35,000 students to participate in the program. Predominately black institutions received 22 grants in FY 1972 and five colleges enrolling a substantial number of Spanish-speaking and American Indian students also received awards.

In FY 1972, 291 institutions requested 11 million dollars. Program officials expect nearly 600 institutional applications for FY 1973, since substantial expansion of the program to encompass career education goals is planned.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January 1972.

BHE Budget Data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Guaranteed Student Loan Program

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Title IV-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; Public Law 89-329 Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969; Public Law 91-95.	June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Loan Volume	Obligations 1/	Appropriation 1/
1966	$ 77,443,000 2/	$ -	$ 10,450,000 2/
1967	248,494,000 2/	15,632,000 2/	44,800,000 2/
1968	435,800,000 2/	39,924,000 2/	43,600,000 2/
1969	686,784,000 2/	62,595,000 2/	74,900,000
1970	839,666,000	112,461,000	62,400,000
1971	1,043,991,000	143,154,000	143,200,000
1972	1,301,677,000	199,571,000	196,600,000
1973	1,355,830,000	246,945,000	245,000,000

1/ Includes advances for reserve funds--excludes computer cost other than administrative expenses, and default payments under the student Loan Insurance Fund.

2/ Includes loans primarily carried under Vocational Education.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to provide low-interest, deferred repayment loans for students attending nearly 4,000 eligible institutions of higher education and nearly 3,500 vocational, technical, business and trade schools.

The principal of the loan is provided by participating lending institutions such as commercial banks, savings and loan association, credit unions, insurance companies, pension funds, and eligible educational institutions. The loan is guaranteed by a State or private non-profit agency or insured by the Federal government.

Loan programs are equally divided between those insured by States and reinsured (80 percent) by the Federal government and those directly insured by the Federal government. A student, however, is eligible if he is enrolled and in good standing or accepted for enrollment at least half time at an eligible institution and is a United States citizen or is in the United States for other than a temporary purpose. The maximum loan per academic year is $2,500 with a maximum aggregate outstanding of $10,000 per individual during undergraduate years and $17,500 including three additional years of graduate study. If the student's adjusted family income is less than $15,000, the Federal government will pay the total interest on the loan until repayment begins and during authorized periods of deferment. The student pays the total interest at an annual percentage rate of 7% during repayment which begins 9-12 months after graduation or withdrawal from school. Deferments are allowed for return to school as a full-time student and up to three years for military service, Peace Corps, or VISTA.

A special allowance is authorized to be paid to lenders when the Secretary determines that economic conditions are impeding or threatening to impede the fulfillment of the purposes of the Program or that the return to the lender is less than equitable. The rate which is determined quarterly, may not exceed 3% per annum on the average unpaid balance of loans made after August 1, 1969.

Nationally chartered banks comprise about one-third of the lenders while 44.6% of the lenders are State banks. A rapidly increasing number of mutual savings banks, savings and loan institutions and credit unions are becoming eligible lenders.

Program Effectiveness:

The Guaranteed Student Loan Program is designed to make low-cost, deferred repayment loans available to all who are studying at least half-time regardless of family income. A major test of its effectiveness, therefore, is whether it serves a broad group of students and whether demand for this unique type of loan has been increasing proportionate with other forms of student aid. The GSL Program appears to have broad appeal, measured by income category, age and status of borrower, race and sex. Of all borrowers enrolled in 1970-71, 28.7% were from families with gross incomes of less than $6,000 while 32.4% were from families with gross income of $12,000 and over. 62.1% of the borrowers are in the normal undergraduate age range of 18-23 but 34.5% are in the 24-35 age group, indicating substantial use of guaranteed loans by graduate students and adults resuming their education. The distribution of loans by academic status is 57.6% for freshmen - sophmore students, and 38.3% for upperclassmen and graduate students. 9.2% of borrowers are black even though blacks constitute only 6.9% of the total undergraduate population. Nearly 2 out of 3 borrowers are male, about the same proportion of males as found in the total undergraduate population.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Lybrand, Ross Bros., and Montgomery conducted an evaluation of customer discrimination practices in December - January of 1969-70. This study included an extensive student data questionnaire, the results of which are not yet fully analyzed.

The Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation will conduct a broad study of certain aspects of the GSLP in 1973-74. The study will include establishment of a Default Estimation Model and profiling of borrower characteristics and lender practices.

The HEW FAST Task Force has been conducting a continuing evaluation of the management structure and operation of the program.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

National Direct Student Loan Program

Legislation:

Title IV, Part E of the HEA 1965 Public Law 89-329, as amended

Expiration Date

June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization *	Appropriation **
1966	$ 179,300,000	$ 181,550,000
1967	190,000,000	192,000,000
1968	225,000,000	193,400,000
1969	210,000,000	193,400,000
1970	325,000,000	195,460,000
1971	375,000,000	243,000,000
1972	375,000,000	293,000,000 1/
1973	400,000,000	585,970,000

* Authorization for contribution to loan funds only. In addition, a total of $25,000,000 was authorized for loans to institutions from Fiscal Year 1959 through the duration of the Act.

**Appropriation includes contributions to loan funds, loans to institutions and Federal payments to repay the institutional share of cancellations.

1/Includes $23,800,000 forward funded for use during FY 1973.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to fund postsecondary institutions for the purpose of making long-term, low-interest loans to students with financial need. Such loans complement other forms of student financial assistance such as educational opportunity grants, college work-study, and insured student loans. Because of the long term repayment period, and the maximum loan ceiling of $1,000 per year, students can repay even maximum NDS loans with little burden on current income. Because the interest on the loan is subsidized while the student is in school, and accrues at a rate of only 3 percent during the repayment period, the student's total repayment is never more than about 120 percent of the total original loan.

Funding is initially allocated to States by means of a special allotment formula. Funding levels for institutions within each State are decided by regional review panels consisting of OE Program Officers from the regional and national offices and financial aid officers selected from institutions in that region. Panel approved requests are generally in excess of the annual NDSL allocation for a State. In such cases, the entire group of institutions within a State receives less than 100 percent of their panel approved amount. However, each institution within that group receives a pro-rated reduction in its allocation which, in percentage, is equal to that of every other institution in the State. Institutions often distribute NDS loans in conjunction with other forms of financial aid and financial aid officers hold different views of how to "package" these various aid components. Undergraduates may borrow up to $1,000 a year. Graduate and professional students may borrow up to $2,500 a year. Total undergraduate NDSL indebtedness must not exceed $5,000, while the aggregate loans of a graduate or professional student must not exceed $10,000 for all years. Upon leaving the institution, students sign a repayment agreement which specifies the duration, interest rate and amount of repayment. After a nine month grace period following cessation of studies, the student begins repayments (at least quarterly) over a ten year period or less at his option. The ten year repayment period may be deferred when the borrower completes up to three years of service with Vista, the Peace Corps, or military service. A student completing his course of studies, and qualifying for maximum loan deferral, would not begin repaying his final year loan until four years and six months after receiving such loan and would not complete repayment of that loan until fourteen years, six months after the initial receipt of loan. In the instance of a freshmen borrowing and later attending graduate school for three years, plus full deferral, the repayments will not begin until ten and one-half years after receipt of initial loan and repayments would not be completed until twenty and one-half years after receipt of such loan. The average repayment period for loans now fully repaid is about seven years, reflecting the small number of students who borrow over the maximum duration and/or who make full use of the deferral provisions. Another feature of the program's operation is the cancellation privilege offered borrowers who later become teachers. Those who teach in specifically designated low income schools or schools for handicapped children, may have up to 100 percent of their loans cancelled for five years of teaching service according to variable formulas. As of July 1, 1970, loans may be cancelled at the 12-1/2 percent for each year of military service up to a total of 4 years.

Program Effectiveness:

The effectiveness of the NDSL Program can best be measured by (1) the extent of utilization of this type of loan; and
(2) the extent to which the average amount of loan is adequate for the individual borrower relative to the cost of his education and the other student financial aid. This latter criterion is partially circumscribed by the total amount which an individual can borrow each year ($1,000) and by the relationship between the total NDSL funds available to the institution and the total number of students applying for loans. Thus, the effectiveness of the Program depends partly upon more fully satisfying

the total demand for this type of loan, but, also, upon the "packaging" practices which determine the average amount of loans at each institution.

Presently, loan applications from institutions are about 30 percent in excess of final panel-approved amounts. Panel-approved amounts have typically exceeded actual Program appropriations by about 40 percent. Since institutional requests are typically inflated to correct for expected panel reductions, such requests are not an accurate measure of need. However, since institutional requests are partly formulated with reference to prior year funding, it is equally possible that such requests understate real need.

The NDSL Program had provided, cumulatively, loans to over 2 million students through FY 1970. The average amount of loan was $532 in FY 1970. Below is a comparison of growth rates in total appropriations, new students served, and average loan amount for the seven-year period ending FY 1972.

Year	Total Appropriations	New Borrowers	Average Loan
1966	23.8%	16.1%	8.8%
1967	5.8	- .8	- 1.2
1968	.7	-5.8	- 7.1
1969	0	17.3	3.6
1970	1.1	-2.3	1.5
1971	24.3	42.0*	22.2*
1972	30.3	9.1*	3.1*

* Estimates

The rapid expansion of the Insured Student Loan Program ("Guaranteed Loans") indicates total loan demand many times that of the NDSL Program appropriation. This suggests that the total number of NDSL borrowers might be significantly expanded. However, the average amount of loan is not likely to increase much beyond $750 because of the large number of borrowers attending low-cost public institutions.

An important criterion for program effectiveness is the proportion of NDSL loans going to lower income students. 74 percent of NDS loans are made to borrowers whose parents' income is below $9,000. Since Program effectiveness is partially defined by its service to lower-income groups, it is clear that the NDSL Program effectively reaches this group.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study conducted by Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, is scheduled for completion in August, 1973.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Upward Bound Program

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A Section 408; Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230; as amended by Public Law 92-318.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	*	*
1966	*	*
1967	*	*
1968	*	*
1969	*	*
1970	$29,600,000[1]	$29,600,000
1971	30,061,000[1]	30,061,000
1972	32,669,000[1]	32,669,000
1973	100,000,000[1]	38,331,000 est.

*There were no specific authorizations or appropriations for Upward Bound during these years. This was an OEO agency allocation made from the total appropriations of Title II-A of the Economic Opportunity Act.

[1] Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 funds authorized were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search. (A total of $100,000,000 is authorized for the three programs in FY 1973.)

Program Purpose and Operation:

Upward Bound is designed for the low-income high school student who, without the program, would not have considered college enrollment nor would he have been likely to have gained admission to and successfully completed a two- or four-year college or other postsecondary school. In a typical year an Upward Bound student is a resident on a college, university, or secondary school campus for a six- to eight-week summer session. In the academic year he may attend Saturday classes or tutorial/counseling sessions or participate in cultural enrichment activities. During his junior and senior years he explores many options for the postsecondary preparation and program best suited to his needs.

Upward Bound looks for the individual who has a demonstrated aptitude for a career which demands postsecondary education but whose faulty preparation prevents him from meeting conventional criteria for admission to a college, university or technical institute. It is designed to generate skills by means of remedial instruction, altered curriculum, tutoring, cultural exposure and encouragement so that the goal of Upward Bound, admission and success in higher education can be achieved.

Upward Bound programs may include cooperative arrangements among one or more colleges and universities and secondary schools. High school students enrolled in these programs receive stipends of up to $30 per month. Federal financial assistance for these programs may not exceed 80 percent of the total or $1,400 per student.

The Upward Bound program is operative (summer 1972 and academic year 1972-73) at 316 projects at colleges, universities and a select number of residential secondary schools.

Programs include (1) coordination, where feasible, of Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services for Disadvantaged Students; (2) increased attention to students in cultural and geographic isolation; (3) projects to overcome motivational and academic barriers to acceptance at and success in a two- or four-year college.

Recent Census data reveals that there are about 1,800,000 students in the tenth to twelfth grades from poor families (less than $3,000 family income), and near-poor families (less than $5,000 family income). These 1,800,000 students constitute the upper limit of the Upward Bound target population. Census data also show that for the high school graduates of this poor and near-poor income group who were 18 to 24 years old in 1970, about 40 percent had entered college by October 1970.

About 60 percent of all high school graduates are now entering college eventually. This rate includes the many high school graduates who enter college later than the same year of high school graduation ("delayed entrants") as well as the slightly over half of all high school graduates who enter college in the year of high school graduation. Therefore, if low-income high school graduates (up to $5,000 family income) are to enroll in college at the same rate as all high school graduates, an additional 20 percent of low-income quartile high school graduates must complete high school and enroll in college. Since about 40 percent of the low-income quartile students enter college on their own, Upward Bound must concentrate on attracting the 20 percent who are not to obtain national parity. This 20 percent of the 1,800,000 low-income tenth to twelfth graders constitutes, therefore, the target population of Upward Bound. Upward Bound, consequently, must get about 360,000 (.20 X 1,800,000) of these tenth to twelfth grade students through high school and into college if the college entrance rate for high school graduates from families with incomes below $5,000 is to equal the college entrance rate for all families.

Program Effectiveness: Program Effectiveness can be measured in part by determining whether Upward Bound participants have a better college enrollment rate than the norm for their income group. A chart showing Upward Bound graduates and college enrollees follows:

Upward Bound Graduates

Calendar Year	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971 a/	TOTAL
Total Upward Bound High School Graduates	1,357	878	5,060	9,690	8,329	8,702	8,000	42,016
Initial Report Enrollment 2 & 4 year colleges	1,073	714	3,692	6,924	6,223	6,703	6,000	31,329
	(79.1%)	(81.3%)	(73.0%)	(71.5%)	(74.7%)	(77.0%)	(75.0%)	(74.6%)
Actual Enrollment 2 & 4 year colleges	960 (70.7%)	614 (69.9%)	3,527 (69.7%)	6,648 (68.6%)	5,891 (70.7%)	6,012 (69.1%)	5,600 (70.0%)	29,252 (69.6%)
Other Postsecondary Enrollment	11 (.8%)	6 (.7%)	183 (3.6%)	439 (4.5%)	327 (3.9%)	335 (3.8%)	400 (5.0%)	1,701 (4.0%)
Other (e.g., Armed Service, Employment, Marriage, VISTA, etc.	386 (23.5%)	258 (29.4%)	1,350 (26.7%)	2,603 (26.9%)	2,111 (25.3%)	2,355 (27.1%)	2,000 (25.0%)	11,063 (26.3%)

a/ Estimates based upon preliminary data

NOTE: Differences between previous reports and this one are due to additional updating of information of former Upward Bound Students.

From the above chart it can be seen that enrollment of the Upward Bound students exceeded the national mean of .40 for low income quartile students.

A number of studies of the Upward Bound program have been completed. The most recent evaluation by Greenleigh Associates found:

1. Upward Bound students are generally representative of the academically underachieving and economically disadvantaged youth in America.

2. The Upward Bound program is an effective dropout prevention program as well as a channel to college.

3. College retention rates of Upward Bound graduates are equal to or greater than the national average.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

An up-dated evaluation of Upward Bound is tentatively planned for FY 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 222, "School Enrollment: October 1970." derived from tables 14 and 15, and unpublished data obtained from the Bureau of the Census.

UPWARD BOUND 1965-69: A History and Synthesis of Data on the Program in the Office of Economic Opportunity, February 1970, Greenleigh Associates, New York, N. Y.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Talent Search Program

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A, Section 408, Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230; as amended by Public Law 92-318.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	*	$ 2,000,000
1967	*	2,500,000
1968	*	4,000,000
1969	$ 4,000,000	4,000,000
1970	5,000,000 1/	5,000,000
1971	5,000,000 1/	5,000,000
1972	5,000,000 1/	5,000,000
1973	100,000,000 1/	6,000,000 est.

* Such sums as may be necessary.

1/ Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 funds authorized were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search. A total of $100,000,000 is authorized for the three programs in FY 1973.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Talent Search is a project grant and contract program which works through institutions of higher education, and public and private agencies and organizations to provide services to low-income youth from the 7th through 12th grades. The ultimate goal of this program is to equalize educational opportunities for low-income students through: (1) identification and encouragement of qualified youth of financial or cultural need: (2) publication of existing forms of student financial aid; and (3) encouragement of secondary-school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs including post-secondary school programs.

The Commissioner may enter into contracts with or award grants to institutions of higher education, combinations of institutions of higher education, and public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations (including professional and scholarly associations). In addition, he may enter into contracts with public and private agencies. Grants and contracts are limited to $100,000 per year and funding selections are made on the basis of program proposals submitted by eligible parties on or before a date set by the Commissioner.

According to recent Census data, there are about 5,100,000 young people between the ages of 13 to 21 who are poor or near-poor. This group is made up of 3,600,000 young people from families of less than $3,700 income, and 1,500,000 young people from families with an annual income from $3,700 to $4,700. These groups constitute the upper limit, or the target population, for the Talent Search program.

There are, also, a large number of newly released veterans over 21 years old who need the services of Talent Search. Coupled with high unemployment rates among the 800,000 to 1,000,000 servicemen who return to Civilian life each year is an education pattern reflected in the following statistics:

> 20 to 25% of Vietnam veterans have had less than a high school level of education; 15% have completed some college work.
>
> 20 to 25% of Vietnam veterans received combat training only and are returning to civilian life inadequately prepared for employment.

In 1972-73, Talent Search is directing services to more of these veterans.

During academic year 1971-72 (fiscal year 1971), services were provided to 125,000 young people from grades 7 through 12. A total of 28,612 were placed in post-secondary education compared with an academic year 1970-71 placement figure of 25,891. In addition, 1,684 dropouts were persuaded to return to school and 2,039 enrolled in high school equivalency programs. 104 projects were funded with the $5 million appropriation in FY 1972.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of Talent Search is tentatively planned to begin in FY 1973.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.
U. S. Census, published and unpublished statistics.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV Part A, Section 408; Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230; as amended by Public Law 92-318.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
	1970	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000
	1971	15,000,000	15,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	15,000,000
	1973	100,000,000 1/	23,000,000 est.

1/ Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 funds authorized were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search. A total of $100,000,000 is authorized for the three programs in FY 1973.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Special Services is a project grant program making awards to institutions of higher education to provide services to disadvantaged students.

The goal of this program is to provide remedial and other supportive services for students with academic potential who because of educational, cultural, or economic background, or physical handicap are in need of counseling, tutorial or other supportive services, career guidance and placement.

Recent Census data shows that there were about 1,200,000 poor and near-poor (up to $5,000 family income) eleventh and twelfth grade high school students. At least 65 percent (800,000) within the income group will be expected to graduate from high school, and at least 40 percent (320,000) of the high school graduates will be expected to enter college eventually. The 320,000 low-income students, plus those physically handicapped students from families above $5,000 income, constitute the upper limit of the target population in need of special services. More clearly defined statistics on the target population for this program will become available upon completion of the current study of special services programs in 1973. Preliminary evidence from this evaluation reveals that, in fall 1971, 14 percent of all undergraduates came from families with an income that places them within the federal government's poverty classification; this is the target population that the Special Services program focuses on. Also, while about half of all colleges report enrolling 11 percent or more financially disadvantaged undergraduates, no more than 20 percent of all colleges have a post-matriculation special services type program--however funded--for low-income students.

The program completed its second year of operation on June 30, 1972. In FY 1972, 208 projects were funded, at an average cost of $68,000 per project, serving 48,700 students. The average cost per student was about $300.00.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Southeastern Office of Educational Testing Service, Durham, North Carolina, is conducting an evaluation study which will be completed in early 1973.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.
U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 222, "School Enrollment: October 1970," derived from tables 14 and 15, and unpublished data obtained from the Bureau of the Census.

Programmatic Attention to "Disadvantaged" Students by Institutions of Higher Education in the United States: A Census for 1971-72, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, September 1972 (draft final report from phase one of the evaluation of the program for Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Higher Education).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening Developing Institutions

Legislation:	Expiration Date
Higher Education Act of 1965, Title III; Public Law 89-329, as amended	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$ 55,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	1967	30,000,000	30,000,000
	1968	55,000,000	30,000,000
	1969	35,000,000	30,000,000
	1970	70,000,000	30,000,000
	1971	91,000,000	33,850,000
	1972	91,000,000	51,850,000
	1973	100,000,000	87,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to assist developing institutions of higher education in strengthening their academic, administrative, and student services programs so that they can become financially viable and can offer higher quality education to their students.

Two and four-year colleges which meet broad criteria for "developing" status may apply for funds with which to enter into cooperative arrangements with other colleges; and may apply for national teaching fellows or professors emeriti. Cooperative arrangements may involve an agreement with an "assisting" institution and with several other developing institutions in a consortium. Such arrangements may involve exchange of faculty or students, visiting scholars, faculty and administration improvements, introduction of new curricula and curricular materials, and joint use of facilities such as libraries and laboratories. National Teaching Fellows and Professors Emeriti are selected by the grantee institutions.

Approximately 500 colleges are currently participating in Cooperative arrangements through Title III. About 200 projects are funded at these institutions. There were also about 550 National Teaching Fellowships awarded for FY 1972 and about 70 professors emeriti participated in the program. Of the 556 institutions aided, 95 predominately or historically Black colleges participated and received 30,933,000, or 59.7 percent of the funds.

The total funding of the Program was not increased beyond the initial level of $30 million until FY '71 and FY '72 when appropriations were $33.850 million in FY 71 to $51.850 million in FY '72. Institutional requests exceed program appropriations by about 2.5 times.

Preliminary results from an evaluation study suggest that institutional development is sequential starting with a "basic needs" levels, in which the institution has not yet managed the daily techniques of simple operation, including payroll, academic and fiscal record-keeping, student counseling, and curriculum development. Stage 2 is a stage in which these basic tasks of existence have been learned and in which the institution is moving to develop some kind of sense of identity and mission. (From the data it was quite clear that cost-effectiveness does not become a legitimate factor until the institution has developed a fairly clear sense of mission. Before this happens there is no way in which the institution could decide to not do certain things and to do others.) After this second stage of identity has been accomplished, institutions then move to a third stage, in which they are beginning to tackle more interesting, stimulating, and complex problems.

Although the study was unable to find a cut-off point below which institutions were too poor to "deserve" Title III funding, it did find a number of institutions that were doing so well that Title III was clearly not needed to "keep them afloat."

Changes have been proposed for the funds authorized above the $52 million funding level for FY 1973 taking the evaluation fundings into consideration. Not only the program purpose but the evaluation of these programs will be affected.

Program Effectiveness:

No data on program effectiveness has yet been compiled and analyzed.

Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation conducted by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berleley, was completed in March 1973.

Other Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Annual Interest Grants

Legislation:

Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended 1968; Title III, Section 306; Public Law 88-204.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1969	$ 5,000,000	$ 3,920,000
1970	11,750,000	11,750,000
1971	25,250,000	21,000,000
1972	38,750,000	29,010,000
1973	52,250,000	31,425,000 1/

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to reduce the cost to institution of higher learning of obtaining private loans for construction purposes.

Loans obtained by institutions of higher education in amounts up to 90% of project development cost may be eligible for annual interest grant assistance. The annual grant made under this program covers the difference between annual debt service which would result from a 3 percent loan and the debt service actually obtained. Not more than 12 1/2 percent of the appropriation for the year may be used in any one State.

In FY 1972 310 grants totaling $9.7 million were approved to support approximately $515 million in construction loans. 259 institutions were aided by this program. Of these 69 were 2 year community colleges. They received grants totaling $1,924,412 which subsidized interest on loans valued at $121 million.

The program has been targeted to those institutions having the greatest need and serving the greatest number of disadvantaged students but this strategy has not been completely successful. In general, colleges with the greatest need for help have poor credit ratings and are least able to avail themselves of the help provided in this program.

To remedy this situation Sec. 746 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 provides assistance to qualified institutions in securing loans by insuring payment of interest and principal on such loans.

1/ New grants have been authorized under the continuing resolution. Request for funds for this program have been included in the supplemental budget request.

Program Effectiveness:

No form of assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

An evaluation of facilities' needs and program impact is being made by Froomkin, Inc. under contract to OPBE.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities

Legislation:	**Expiration Date**
Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended; Title I; Section 103, 104 Public Law 88-204; Public Law 89-329; 20 U.S.C. 701 as amended by Higher Education Amendments of 1972	June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$230,000,000	$230,000,000
1966	460,000,000	458,000,000
1967	475,000,000	453,000,000
1968	728,000,000	400,000,000
1969	936,000,000	83,000,000
1970	936,000,000	76,000,000
1971	936,000,000	43,000,000
1972	50,000,000	43,000,000
1973	200,000,000	No appropriation

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide grants to higher education institutions to finance the construction, rehabilitation and improvement of undergraduate facilities.

Funds for public community colleges and public technical institutes under this program are allotted to each state by a formula based on the number of high school graduates and per capital income of residents. Funds for other institutions are alloted to each state by a formula based on the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education and the number of students in grades 9 through 12. Within each state, federal grants may be awarded for up to 50 per cent of the project development cost. Twenty four per cent of funds appropriated under the Title are reserved for community and technical colleges and schools.

Assistance is not given for facilities for which admission is normally charged. It is also not given for facilities used for sectarian instruction nor for facilities for schools of the health professions as defined in the Higher Education Facilities Act. In addition, funds are not provided for residential, dining, and student union purposes.

The law requires each state to set up a state Commission for Higher Education Facilities. This Commission determines priorities and the federal share within the state for each project submitted.

In FY 1972 250 grants totalling $43,733,899 were made to 229 institutions. 73 of the institutions were public community colleges which received 75 grants totalling $10,613,255.

In the 1960's, the total number of students in higher education increased by 3 million. HEFA, passed in 1963, made a significant contribution in providing the resultant needed additional academic facilities. That need is now not nearly so great and it is anticipated that by FY 74 private funding can accomodate whatever need there is for new construction.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of facilities' need and program impact is being done by Froomkin, Inc. under contract to USOE.

Sources of Education Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Administration and Planning

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; as amended; Title I, Section 105; Public Law 88-204.	June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 3,000,000	$ 3,000,000
1966	2,000,000	2,000,000
1967	7,000,000*	7,000,000
1968	7,000,000	7,000,000
1969	7,000,000	7,000,000
1970	7,000,000	6,000,000
1971	7,000,000	6,000,000
1972	7,000,000	6,000,000

* Higher Education Amendments of 1966 (PL 89 -752), Sec. 3 not more than $3,000,000 may be expended in any fiscal year for the purpose of proper and efficient administration of State plans including such expenses which were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 requires the establishment of State commissions to develop and to administer the State plan for the undergraduate facilities construction grants program. Grants are available to these commissions to cover the costs of administration of the state plans under this title, and the instructional equipment grant program under Part A of Title VI of the HEA. Under the Higher Education Amendments of 1966, grants are also available to the same commissions for comprehensive planning to study future facilities needs in higher education.

Each state desiring to participate under Title I of HEFA is required to designate an existing state agency or establish a new agency which is representative of the public and of institutions of higher education. The agency's plan for state participation must be approved by the Commissioner.

In FY 72, 54 state commissions were awarded grants totaling $2.8 million for administration of AEFA programs. Basic comprehensive planning grants totaling $2.1 million were awarded to 53 states. In addition, a total of $1 million went to 45 model cities in 40 states to fund their planning.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of facilities need and program impact is being done by Froomkin, Inc. under contract to USOE.

Source of Data:

Factbook: Bureau of Higher Education, January 1972
Data from Bureau of Higher Education Public Law 92-318

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Foreign Language and Areas Centers, Research, and Studies

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
National Defense Education Act of 1958. Title VI; Public Law 85-864; as amended by Public Law 88-665; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 92-318	June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1959	$ 8,000,000	$ 3,416,000
1960	8,000,000	7,300,000
1961	8,000,000	6,554,000
1962	8,000,000	8,000,000
1963	8,000,000	7,970,000
1964	8,000,000	8,000,000
1965	13,000,000	13,000,000
1966	14,000,000	14,000,000
1967	16,000,000	15,800,000
1968	18,000,000	15,700,000
1969	16,050,000	15,450,000
1970	30,000,000	12,850,000
1971	38,500,000	7,170,000
1972	38,500,000	13,940,000
1973	50,000,000	12,500,000 est.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Programs for foreign language and area studies funded under this appropriation have four major purposes: (1) increase the nation's manpower pool of trained specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (2) provide inservice training to upgrade and update the professional knowledge and skills of existing specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (3) produce new knowledge about other nations and cultures, particularly those of the non-Western world, through research and development; and (4) develop improved curricula and effective instructional materials in foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs needed by education, government, and business.

The National Defense Education Act, Title VI, authorizes the award of grants and contracts to U. S. educational institutions, organizations, and individuals for activities conducted primarily in the United States. Program assistance includes institutional development, fellowship support, and research in foreign language, area studies, world affairs, and intercultural understanding.

Program Effectiveness:

Recent studies of foreign language and area studies programs in the U. S.[1] reveal the growth in the development of non-Western studies since enactment of the NDEA in 1958. Whereas in 1958, some 37 "uncommonly taught" languages were offered in U. S. universities, in 1972 approximately 85 modern foreign languages were taught at NDEA VI centers alone. A 1970 survey of foreign language enrollments[2] reveals that while higher education registrations in most of the foreign languages traditionally taught in American higher education have been in a distinct downward trend since 1968 (French, German, Russian, Latin, and Ancient Greek), student enrollments in Italian, Spanish, and in over 100 less commonly taught languages taken collectively have increased significantly--by 12.8%, 6.7%, and 39.4%, respectively.

The less commonly taught languages form the crux of the NDEA VI program effort--instruction in 27 languages, most of which are official languages of independent nations, is offered only at NDEA centers; at least 50% of total U. S. course enrollments in 15 other languages are concentrated at NDEA programs.

While enrollments in the uncommonly taught languages are increasing, total enrollments in these languages remain small. For example, in 1970 there were only 5,319 undergraduate and 796 graduate students studying Chinese, and only 12 undergraduates and 6 graduates in Vietnamese. Recent indications are that enrollments in Chinese language courses have increased.

The NDEA foreign language training and area studies program provides a means for correcting existing disciplinary and geographic imbalances, broadening the scope of area training, and improving and maintaining language skills.

The first phase of a major reallocation of program funds according to changing priorities among and within world areas began in 1972. 106 foreign language and area studies centers at 63 U. S. institutions of higher education offered instruction in the language and cultures of countries in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, the U.S.S.R., and Western Europe to approximately 104,000 undergraduate and graduate students. The following table provides data on the world area distribution of National Defense Education Centers in fiscal year 1972.

World Area	Number of Centers	Obligations	Est. Total Enrollments
Eurasia a/	22	$ 1,027,840	18,500
Eastern Asia b/.	27	1,651,200	24,000
Latin America	16	642,400	32,000
South and Southeast Asia	15	1,039,520	12,000
Africa	13	685,400	4,800
Middle East	12	794,240	12,000
Northwest Europe	1	58,400	500
Totals	106	$ 5,899,000	103,800

a/ Includes East European, Slavic, Ural-Altaic and Sino-Soviet Centers.
b/ Includes General and East Asian Centers.

FY 1972 fellowships, targeted on underrepresented disciplines and world areas, were awarded to about 1,500 graduate students planning careers in teaching or public service requiring a knowledge of modern foreign languages and related fields. 39 research contracts were awarded to produce research on methods of teaching.

rogram Effectiveness:

A review of foreign language and area studies programs in the U. S. (based on a sample of 13,000 foreign language and area studies specialists, of whom about 10,000 are college or university faculty members) has provided data on the impact of the NDEA program. A sampling of previous holders of NDEA VI fellowships showed that almost all (89.1%) of the fellows used their foreign area training in their first job. Of the Ph.D. graduates, 99% were employed as language and world area specialists. The survey also indicates that the existing pool of specialists needs more focused development in certain aspects in order to achieve;

An upgrading of language skills. Of the world area specialists surveyed, only 25% reported that they can easily speak, read, and write a language of their area. A major factor in acquiring and maintaining proficiency in foreign languages is the opportunity to utilize the language in the country where it is in regular use. The small amount of money available for continuing research and training abroad is a limiting factor.

Studies on international and intercultural education, and new curricula and instructional materials are intended for use in schools and colleges throughout the U. S. The impact of this program is suggested by a materials utilization survey which provides specific data on instructional materials for 50 different languages in 82 foreign language and area studies programs. Results of the survey show, for example, that of 24 respondent institutions engaged in teaching Chinese, 21, or 88 percent were using materials produced under National Defense Education Title VI support; of 17 programs offering instruction in Hindi, 100 percent were using National Defense Education materials; and 6 out of 7 Arabic programs similarly reported utilization of National Defense Education-supported materials.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies: **None**

Sources of Evaluation Data:

[1] Language and Area Studies Program Review, Richard D. Lambert (to be published in Spring 1973 by the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the Social Science Research Council); International Studies and the Social Sciences: A Survey of the Status of International/Comparative Studies and Recommendations Concerning National Needs and Priorities, James N. Rosenau (Minneapolis, Minnesota: International Studies Association, June 1971); 1970 Census of International Programs in State College and Universities, American Association of State College and Universities (Washington, D. C.; AASCU Studies 1971/3, August 1971).

[2] Fall 1970 Survey of Foreign Language Registrations in U. S. Institutions of Higher Education, Modern Language Association (ADFL Bulletin, December 1971).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Fulbright - Hays Act

Legislation:

Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Section 102 (b) (6); Public Law 87-256; as amended by Public Law 87-565; as amended by Public Law 89-698.

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1964	1/	$ 1,500,000
1965		1,500,000
1966		2,000,000
1967		3,000,000
1968		3,000,000
1969		3,000,000
1970		2,430,000
1971		830,000
1972		1,323,000
1973		1,360,000 est.

1/ Indefinite, does not require specific money authorization.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Programs for foreign language and area studies funded under this appropriation have four major purposes: (1) increase the nation's manpower pool of trained specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (2) provide inservice training to upgrade and update the professional knowledge and skills of existing specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (3) produce new knowledge about other nations and cultures, particularly those of the non-Western world; and (4) develop curricula and instructional materials in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs needed by education, government, and business.

Programs funded under the Fulbright-Hays Act Section 102 (b) (6) provide first-hand experience in the area of specialization, update and extend research knowledge, and maintain and improve language skills. Program assistance includes fellowships for faculty and doctoral dissertation research, group projects for research and training.

curriculum consultant services of foreign educators to improve foreign languages, area studies, world affairs, and intercultural education in U. S. schools and colleges.

A recent review of foreign language and area studies programs in the U. S.[1] demonstrated that adequate opportunities for research and study abroad are critical to improving the quality of specialist training. Over 85% of those included in the survey reported a need to increase opportunities for studying language in its natural setting. While in absolute terms there has been substantial growth in the numbers of specialists with some overseas experience, the survey reveals that on the average the depth of experience abroad remains quite shallow. Furthermore, although as a group the specialists have had experience in a wide range of countries, the research of a majority of the specialists has been clustered in a relatively small number of countries. In brief, a few countries are overstudied, relatively speaking, while a large number are understudied.

The Fulbright-Hays and Excess Foreign Currency programs provide a limited number of educators and scholars in foreign languages and area studies with a means for upgrading and maintaining language skills, acquiring first-hand knowledge, and conducting original research in their area of specialization.

In FY 1972, 151 Ph.D. candidates in foreign language and area studies received fellowships for dissertation research abroad in 53 countries on a variety of topics. Examples include the political dynamics of health care in China, the law and administration of environmental quality in the U.S.S.R., a study of decision making in Japanese industry, and an analysis of urban growth in Nigeria.

Group projects abroad included assistance to two interuniversity centers for instensive advanced language training in Chinese and Japanese (in Taipei and Tokyo, respectively) and 5 ethnic heritage seminars abroad for educational personnel conducting or planning ethnic studies programs in U.S. schools.

Fourteen curriculum consultant grants provided U. S. schools, State departments of education, and small four-year colleges with opportunities to develop curricula and teaching materials in international studies with the assistance of educational specialists from 9 countries.

In fiscal year 1973 this program will support 120 doctoral dissertation research fellowships, 11 group projects, 25 curriculum consultant grants, and 20 faculty research fellowships.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

[1] Language and Area Studies Program Review, Richard D. Lambert (to be published in Spring 1973 by the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the Social Science Research Council).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Community Service and Continuing Education Program

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965. Title I; Public Law 89-329; 20 U.S.C. 1001 as amended by Public Law 90-575; 20 U.S.C. 1001, 1005, 1006. As amended by Higher Education Amendments of 1972.

Expiration Date:

June 20, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 25,000,000	$ 10,000,000
1967	50,000,000	10,000,000
1968	50,000,000	10,000,000
1969	10,000,000	9,500,000
1970	50,000,000	9,500,000
1971	60,000,000	9,500,000
1972	10,000,000	9,500,000
1973	30,000,000	15,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide grants to the States to strengthen those programs of colleges and universities which assist in the solution of community problems such as housing, transportation, health, etc. The program is administered in each State by a State agency designated by the Governor under a State plan approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The State Agency establishes priorities for its State and approves institutional proposals to be funded. Funds are provided on a 66 2/3 percent Federal and a 33 1/3 percent non-Federal basis.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1972 extended this program through fiscal year 1975 and authorize the Commissioner to reserve up to 10% of the appropriation for grants and contracts covering up to 90% of the cost of special programs and projects designed to seek solutions to national and regional problems of technological change and environmental pollution

OE strategy is to fund fewer, larger, and more comprehensive projects that may remain permanent features of institutions after the period of Title I funding and to fund those which will provide appropriate higher education contributions to selected national priorities of environmental and ecological education, drug abuse education, assistance to the Model Cities programs, and the improvement of state and local government services. In addition to traditional types of program such as specifically designed seminars, conferences, and continuing education courses, the development and demonstration of new mechanisms such as community centers, consortia, and urban agents are being tried.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Higher Education Amendments of 1972 require the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education to review Title I programs carried our prior to July 1, 1973 to ascertain which show the greatest promise and greatest return for resources devoted to them. This is to be completed by March 31, 1975.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Land-Grant Colleges and Universities Program

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Second Morrill Act of 1890, as amended; 26 Stat. 417; 7 U.S.C. 322, 323; Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended; 49 Stat. 439; Public Law 182; 7 U.S.C. 329 as amended Title IX, Sec. 506 Higher Education Amendments of 1972.	None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization*	Appropriation
1961	$ 5,052,000	$ 5,052,000
1962	14,500,000	14,500,000
1963	14,500,000	14,500,000
1964	14,500,000	14,500,000
1965	14,500,000	14,500,000
1966	14,500,000	14,500,000
1967	14,500,000	14,500,000
1968	14,500,000	14,500,000
1969	14,720,000	14,550,000
1970	14,922,000	14,720,000
1971	14,720,000	12,680,000
1972	14,720,000	12,600,000
1973	15,260,000*	18,700,000

* This figure does not include the one-time appropriation of $6 million for the two newly designated land-grant colleges of Virgin Islands and Guam.

Program Purpose and Operation:

A land-grant college or university is an institution of higher learning designated by a state legislature for the benefits of the First Morrill Act of 1862 or the second Morrill Act of 1890. The purpose of the original act was to insure the development in each state of at least one college "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts". The second Morrill Act, the Nelson amendment and the Bankhead-Jones Act provide for permanent annual appropriations and grants some of which are allocated on a population basis.

Several amendments have designated Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands as states for the purpose of these Acts. There are now 72 colleges enjoying land-grant status.

Each State receives $50,000 under the Second Morrill Act. Each of these jurisdictions receives $150,000 from Bankhead-Jones funds plus an additional allotment based upon population. Grants are paid to State Treasurers. State legislatures must provide by statute for the division of funds if the state has more than one land-grant institution. No portion of the funds may be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of buildings or to the purchase of land. An annual report on the expenditure of the funds must be made by each institution to the U. S. Office of Education.

In Fiscal Year 1972, 72 institutions received grants under the program. About 94 percent of the funds were used for salaries of instructors and the remainder for instructional equipment.

Program Effectiveness:

Although no formal evaluation has ever been made of these programs, it is evident that the purposes of the Acts have been largely fulfilled. Land-grant colleges and universities educate about a fifth of the currently-enrolled college students and grant 40 percent of the doctoral degrees.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

NDEA Fellowship Programs

Legislation:

HEA Title IX, Part B (Replaces National Defense Education Act of 1958; Public Law 85-864; as amended; 20 U.S.C 462.)

Expiration Date:

June 1973

Funding History:

	New Fellowships Authorized	New	Fellowships Support Continuing	Total	Appropriations
1959	1,000	1,000	-	1,000	$ 5,300,000
1960	1,500	1,500	1,000	2,500	12,650,000
1961	1,500	1,500	2,500	4,000	20,690,000
1962	1,500	1,500	3,000	4,500	22,262,000
1963	1,500	1,500	3,000	4,500	21,200,000
1964	1,500	1,500	3,000	4,500	21,200,000
1965	3,000	3,000	3,000	6,000	32,740,000[1]
1966	6,000	6,000	4,500	10,500	55,961,000[2]
1967	7,500	6,000	9,000	15,000	81,957,000[3]
1968	7,500	3,328	12,000	15,328	86,600,000[4]
1969	7,500	2,905	9,328	12,233	70,000,000
1970	7,500	2,370	6,233 (a)	8,603	48,813,000
1971	7,500	2,100	6,245 (b)	8,345	47,285,500
1972	7,500	0	4,650 (c)	4,650	26,910,000
1973	7,500	0	2,980	2,980	20,005,000

[1] $177,000 of FY 1965 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

[2] $137,000 of FY 1966 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

[3] $1,115,000 of FY 1967 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

[4] $325,000 of FY 1968 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

(a) Includes 170 special fellowships for veterans.
(b) Includes 770 special fellowships for veterans and 200 fourth year fellowships.
(c) Includes 180 special fellowships for veterans.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The aim of this program is to increase the supply of well-trained college teachers and encourage the development of doctoral level education on a broad geographic basis by providing three-year fellowship support for graduate students.

This program aids graduate schools in strengthening their doctoral programs, in developing interdisciplinary programs tailored to prepare teachers in fields of emerging manpower needs, and in helping veterans, formerly on fellowships, resume their education in order to prepare for academic careers.

Each NDEA IV fellowship is a three-year award providing a stipend of $2400 for the first year of study, $2600 for the second, $2800 for the third, and $500 per year for each dependent. In addition, a $2500 per year educational allowance is provided to the institution for each NDEA fellow actively enrolled.

Panels of academic consultants review institutional applications and recommend specific doctoral programs at applying institutions to the Commissioner for final approval of fellowship awards.

Funds budgeted for the College Teacher Fellowship Program (NDEA, Title IV) in FY 73 will support only continuing fellows. 2100 of these will be in their third year--the remaining 880 are returning veterans who are former fellows.

The Program has been reviewed to determine its future role. This was necessary because there no longer appears to be a shortage of college teachers with the doctorate in a number of academic disciplines. The program will expire June 30, 1973. However, Part B of the HEA 1965 as amended in 1972 authorizes a somewhat similar type program.

In FY 72, 203 institutions participated in 3,341 programs fostered by NDEA Fellowships program. There were 4,950 fellows on tenure.

Program Effectiveness:

The study of NDEA Title IV done by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. shows that the program has been successful in several respects. It has resulted in a wide geographic distribution of graduate study centers. Compared to other doctoral students, fellows have taken a shorter average time to complete their doctoral studies. Also their attrition rate has been smaller.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education
Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc.
Study of NDEA Title IV Fellowship Program, Phase I and II. 1968, 1970.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

EPDA, Part E Fellowships

Legislation:

Education Professions Development Act;
Part E, Section 541, Public Law 90-35;
20 U.S.C. 461-465.

Expiration Date:

June 1975

Funding History:	Year	Total Authorization	Fellowships Appropriation
	1969	$21,500,000	$2,200,000
	1970	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1971	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1972	36,000,000	5,044,000
	1973	5% or more of total	2,172,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to increase the supply of well-prepared teachers, administrators, and specialists in areas of critical need for junior-community colleges and 4-year colleges and universities by providing one-and two-year fellowships for graduate level study in non-degree or advanced degree programs (other than the Ph.D. or equivalent for those planning a career in college teaching). Support is provided to: (1) programs that have a high promise for improvement over past practices in their training of higher education personnel; (2) programs that prepare personnel for the higher education needs of students from low-income families; (3) programs that train and retrain teachers, administrators, or educational specialists for junior colleges and 2-year community colleges located in urban areas; (4) programs that prepare personnel in higher education who will serve in developing institutions; (5) programs that prepare administrators, including trustees, presidents, deans, department chairmen, development officers, and financial aid officers; (6) programs that provide graduate level education for women training for careers in higher education; (7) programs that are a basic combination of the above priorities and which show evidence of effective communication between faculty, students, administration, and, where appropriate, local communities in the planning and implementation of the proposed program.

Institutions of higher education apply directly to the Office of Education for fellowships. Applications are reviewed by panels of faculty members and administrators who represent American higher education. Their recommendations are made to the Commissioner of Education.

Fellowship support is provided for one or two years depending on the length of the training program. Financial assistance is distributed in the following manner: $2,400 paid to students for first fellowship year and $2,600 for the second year; fellows are entitled to $500 during the fellowship year for each eligible dependent; the institution receives $2,500 a year for each fellow to pay for his tuition and required non-refundable fees.

In an effort to provide more flexibility in the recruitment of higher education personnel, the following strategies will be implemented on a pilot basis: (1) direct award of fellowships to two-year colleges; (2) award of fellowships to women for part-time study as recommended by the Newman Report; and (3) award of fellowships to programs which begin with the last undergraduate year.

Some indication of the program's reach and operation can be obtained from program funding data and a study of recent graduates respectively.

Program Funding Data

Output Measures		Fiscal Year 1969	1970	1971	1972
Number of Institutions Participating		50	74	82	89
Number of Approved Programs		51	78	93	101
Number of Fellowships Awarded	Total	415	960	903	921*
	(New)	(415)	(640)	470	586
	(Cont.)	(0)	(320)	433	335
Number of Fellowhsips Awarded in the Training of Personnel As:					
	Total	415	960	903	921
Teachers		(324)	(702)	651	660
Education Specialist		(68)	(183)	167	135
Administrators		(23)	(75)	85	126
Number of Fellowships Awarded to Train Personnel to Serve In:					
Total		(415)	960	903	921
Junior Colleges		(289)	(710)	689	731
Other Institutions		(126)	(250)	214	190

	Fiscal Year			
	1969	1970	1971	1972
Average Yearly Amount of Fellowships	$5301	$5208	$5537	$5507

*Estimates for FY 72 are being revised. Therefore figures in this column are subject to revision.

It seems clear from the table that program priorities indicated above are being met both in terms of types of institutions and subject areas.

A study of 253 Part E fellows who have completed their training programs at 22 colleges and universities reveals that 62 percent have accepted jobs in institutions of higher education, some in leadership positions. Of those not now currently employed in higher education, 19 percent are employed in higher education, 19 percent are employed in elementary or secondary education, 10 percent are continuing their education, 4 percent had resigned from the program, 2 percent were in military service, and 3 percent had not yet accepted a job or had good job prospects at the time the reporting was requested.

In another sample, information volunteered from eleven institutions of higher education, which have approved program designed to prepare personnel to work with the disadvantaged, shows that approximately 76 percent of the total or 86 fellowships were awarded to members of minority groups--Blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans, American Indians, and Orientals. In addition, just under 50 percent of the total 113 fellowships reported were awarded to women.

In yet another area, approximately 13 percent of the total 903 1971-72 Part E fellowships were awarded to military veterans.

Program Effectiveness

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies

Study of the EPDA V-E Program by Abt Associates, Cambridge, Mass.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

EPDA, Part E Institutes

Legislation: **Expiration Date:**

Education Professions Development Act of 1967 as amended. Part E, Section 541 through 543; Public Law 90-35 and Public Law 90-575; 20 U.S.C. 1119b.

June, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Total Authorization	Institutes Appropriation
1969	$ 21,500,000	$ 4,700,000
1970	36,000,000	5,000,000
1971	36,000,000	5,000,000
1972	36,000,000	5,800.000
1973	5% or more of Total	5,828,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to train teachers, administrators, or educational specialists for higher education by providing support for institutes and short-term training programs. Emphasis is given three areas: (1) in-service training of personnel from junior and community colleges; (2) in-service training of personnel from developing institutions such as the predominantly black colleges and the small isolated four-year colleges; and (3) the training of higher education personnel to meet the needs of the increasing numbers of minority and low-income students seeking a college education. Since the Part E program began in FY 1969, most of the funds allocated under the EPDA Part E institute program have been focused on these areas of critical need.

In order to have maximum impact on the three priority areas, some emphasis is given to training administrators of junior colleges and developing institutions in modern management techniques.

This program provides support for in-service or pre-service training, part-time or full-time training programs of up to 12 months duration; training of college personnel in a variety of fields, including academic subject-matter areas; instructional methods and equipment, administrative skills, student personnel services, etc. Grants to the institution conducting the training cover all direct and indirect operating costs of the training program, as well as the cost of participant support.

Training must be of graduate-level quality; seminars, conferences, symposia, and workshops are not eligible for support unless they are part of a continuing training program; funds may not be used for purchase of equipment or for travel expenses of trainees.

In FY 1972, $4,725,000 was awarded to institutions of higher education in support of 100 institutes and short-term training programs in 44 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. These programs provided training for approximately 7,930 higher education personnel.

In FY 1972, most of the funds were awarded to three priority areas as follows: (1) $2,013,862 (42.6%) supported programs to train junior college personnel; (2) $3,379,820 (71,5%) supported programs to train higher education personnel to serve minority and low-income students; and (3) $2,014,192 (42.6%) supported programs to train personnel of developing institutions. These allocations to priority areas are not, however, mutually exclusive.

Since FY 1969, the first year of the Part E program, there has been an increasing emphasis on programs for junior college personnel, disadvantaged students, and developing institutions, while the trend in programs for the other (primarily for teachers in non-developing four-year colleges and universities) categories has clearly been in the direction of de-emphasis. While data are not available to assess the long-term impact of this program, it is evident that the EPDA Part E institutes program has focused on the national priorities the program was designed to address.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been complted.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Additional reports will be received from a study conducted by ABT Associates. Other than this, no additional evaluation studies are planned.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities

Legislation:

Title III, P.L. 88-204, P.L. 84-329
Title VII-C as amended by Education Amendments of 1972.

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1964	$ 120,000,000	$ 0
1965	120,000,000	169,250,000
1966	120,000,000	110,000,000
1967	200,000,000	200,000,000
1968	400,000,000	0
1969	400,000,000	100,000,000
1970	400,000,000	0
1971	400,000,000	0
1972	50,000,000	0
1973	200,000,000	0

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to make loans to institutions of higher education and higher education building agencies to assist in the construction or improvement of undergraduate and graduate academic facilities.

The amount of a loan plus any other Federal funds may not exceed 75% of the eligible cost of a project. Loans are made on the basis of approved applications with not more than 12.5% of the appropriation awarded to projects in any one state. Interest on these loans is not to exceed three percent.

In the last few years this program has not received any appropriations--having been supplanted by the Annual Interest Grant Program. However, as previously made loans are paid back small sums become available for additional direct loans. In FY 1972 19 such loans totalling $11,074,000 were made to 18 institutions. The loans were targeted to Black, private colleges.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation:

An evaluation of facilities needs and program impact is being made by Froomkin, Inc. under contract to OPBE.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education.

E. Education Professions Development Programs

1. Attracting Qualified Persons to the Field of Education
2. Teacher Corps Program
3. State Grant Program for Attracting and Qualifying Teachers
4. Educational Leadership Program
5. Career Opportunities Program
6. Early Childhood Program
7. School Personnel Utilization Programs
8. Special Education Program
9. Training of Teacher Trainers Program
10. Pupil Personnel Services Program
11. Urban/Rural School Development Program
12. Teacher Training in Developing Institutions Program
13. Vocational Education Personnel Program

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Attracting Qualified Persons to the Field of Education

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Part A, Sec. 504 of P.L. 90-35 Education Professions Development Act	FY 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$2,500,000	$ -0-
	1970	5,000,000	425,000
	1971	5,000,000	500,000
	1972	-0-	300,000
	* 1973	-0-	-0-

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the EPDA, Section 504(a) is to attract qualified persons to the field of education who ordinarily would not consider this field by:

1. identifying capable youth in secondary schools who may be interested in careers in education and encouraging them to pursue post-secondary education in preparation for such careers;
2. publicizing available opportunities for careers in the field of education;
3. encouraging qualified persons to enter or reenter the field of education and
4. encouraging artists, craftsmen, artisans, scientists, homemakers, and persons from other professions and vocations, to undertake teaching or related assignments on a part-time basis or for temporary periods.

Since passage of the legislation underlying this program, a situation of a national teacher surplus in 1965, has emerged and been recognized. It is equally clear, however, that there are still certain areas in which there is either a shortage of teachers or a lack of highly qualified, highly motivated personnel. These areas include (1) personnel for inner-city or areas having a high concentration of educationally disadvantaged pupils, (2) personnel for bilingual or bicultural education, (3) personnel for vocational or career education and for education of the handicapped.

This program has been redirected to focus on these areas of critical shortages during fiscal year 1972. Four projects are currently in operation.

At the National College of Education in Evanston, Illinois summer workshops to interest high school students in educational careers have been held for the past two summers. These workshops served 289 students.

The National Center for information on Careers in Education provides information on education careers to a variety of persons and organizations. Now operating two-years, the Center is attempting to provide more information to persons from inner-city area as one of its primary objectives.

At Washington Technical Institute, attempts are being made to develop and strengthen the role of volunteers as part-time educational personnel through the development and reproduction of materials that can be used in the training of educational volunteers or professionals using volunteer assistance (Project VOICE). Such volunteer assistance does not contribute to the teacher surplus, but does free teachers from many routine, nonprofessional duties so that they have more time to devote to actual instruction of their pupils.

In Menlo Park, California, the Portola institute is operating a Kids Teaching Kids project which utilizes Mexican-American and low-income high school students as trained paraprofessionals and tutors. Approximately 260 minority high school students have been helped to become aides in elementary schools.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation studies currently underway. No new studies are planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

None.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Teacher Corps Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title V, P.L. 89-329(1965) amended by Part B-1, P.L. 90-35 - Education Professions Development Act	FY 1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 36,100,000	$ 9,500,000
1967	64,715,000	11,324,000
1968	33,000,000	13,500,000
1969	46,000,000	20,900,000
1970	80,000,000	21,737,000
1971	100,000,000	30,800,000
1972	100,000,000	37,435,000
1973	37,500,000	37,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purposes of the Teacher Corps are (1) to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having high concentrations of low-income families, and (2) to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation. To achieve this, the Teacher Corps attracts and trains college graduates and upperclassmen to serve in teams under experienced teachers; attracts volunteers to serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants; and attracts and trains educational personnel to provide specialized training for juvenile delinquents, youth offenders, and adult criminal offenders. Typical participant activities involve academic work in a college or university, on the job training in schools, and participation in school related community projects. Typical program elements include flexible models of teacher education based on performance criteria, involvement with other college and university departments outside the school of education, granting credit for the internship period, and utilization of regular school staff and members of the community in the teaching staff.

During FY 1972, Teacher Corps directly affected the learning experiences of 113,370 children of whom 43,500 (37.6%) were from families with annual incomes below $3,000. Approximately 60 percent of the children were in elementary schools. Teacher Corps programs impacted on 138 school districts, and such special clientele groups as bilingual children, (14 projects), Indian children (7 projects), and children in training institutions (6 projects). Teacher Corps also ran a special program which encourages high school and college students, parents and other community residents to serve as tutors or instructional assistants for children in disadvantaged areas.

Program Effectiveness:

A number of evaluation studies provide information and insight about program operation. For example, a survey of June, 1972 Teacher Corps graduates was conducted by Teacher Corps in August, 1972. Seventy percent, or 900 of 1300 graduates responded. About 570 or 63 percent indicated that they would remain in the field of education with 27% (240) of them teaching in the school district where they served as interns. Ten percent (90) of the interns had not found teaching positions at the time of the survey.

In addition, the Comptroller General's Office issued a report to the Congress in July, 1972, concerning the assessment of the Teacher Corps program made by the General Accounting Office (GAO). The study consisted of a review of Teacher Corps projects at seven institutions of higher education and the respective participating local education agencies. Also, a questionnaire was sent to all Corps members in the Nation who had completed their internships in 1968 and 1969. A total of 550 responded to the questionnaire. The findings and conclusions are grouped according to the two major program purposes as follows:

1. Strengthening educational opportunities

The GAO found that the program strengthened the educational opportunities for children of low-income families who attended schools where Corps members were assigned. Corps members provided more individualized instruction, used new teaching methods, and expanded classroom and extracurricular activities. Most of the interns and team leaders believed that children in the schools served by the problem had benefited from it. The classroom assistance provided by interns made it possible for regular teachers to devote more time to individualized instruction and make classes more relevant to the needs of the children.

Some of the Teacher Corps approaches to educating children were continued by the school districts after corps members completed their assignments. Other approaches were discontinued because the school districts either had not determined their usefulness or did not have sufficient staff and financial resources to carry them on. Corps members generally became involved with various types of educational community activities which most Corps members believe had been of benefit to both children and adults. Some believed, however, that the activities were of little or no benefit due to poor planning and lack of community support. A major of the interns who graduated from the program remained in the field of education. Most of these interns took teaching positions in schools serving low-income areas.

2. Broadening teacher-training program

The GAO study indicates that the program had some success in broadening teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education. All seven institutions made some changes in their regular teacher preparation program as a result of the Teacher Corps. Five institutions developed a special curriculum for the Teacher Corps; the other two used existing courses. Most interns believed that their academic coursework was relevant to their needs. The impact of the program was lessened, however, because much of the special curriculum was not made available to non-Teacher Corps students and because institutions had not identified teaching approaches and techniques that would warrant inclusion in their regular teacher preparation programs. The institutions that used existing courses for Teacher Corps students did not determine the effectiveness of these courses in preparing Corps members to teach disadvantaged children.

Another relevant study is the Resource Management Corporation evaluation of Teacher Corps during FY 72. This evaluation covered 70 projects having 2,490 interns. Sixty-three projects with approximately 1900 interns responded to the survey instruments. The major conclusion drawn from this study was that while the Teacher Corps projects (63 studied) had done a fairly good job in terms of operating within program guidelines there were some areas that stood out as meriting attention by program specialists. The academic training offered to interns, for example, was much more flexible than desired by the program staff. Only 31 percent of the total course-work was open for negotiation by interns, with 69 percent required by the college or project. This finding differed significantly from the 50-50 balance established as a program goal. In addition, interns perceived a lack of communication between groups within a project and cited this as the major problem area for the program. A further area of concern was in the superficial involvement of many advisory councils and of the community in general in project operations. One example was that in 26 projects advisory councils met quarterly or semi-annually. Finally, considerably more projects emphasized change in college training programs as opposed to change in the school systems.

At least one analysis of a particular project -- the Louisville, Kentucky Cycle V Project -- offers further useful insight into program operations and accomplishments. The major thrust of this project was to strengthen educational opportunities in inner-city schools by training

100 Teacher Corps interns to become working partners on facilitating teams. These interns were an integral part of a ten-member teaching teams employing humanistic learning processes, relevant curriculum and flexible educational structures. The teaching staffs of six elementary schools were reassigned as necessary so that these schools could be completely restructured around 3 to 6 teaching teams each composed of one experienced coordinating teacher (team leader), another experienced teacher (staff teacher), four Teacher Corps interns, two paraprofessionals, and student teachers when available. Each team instructed approximately 100 children in an open learning environment.

During the first year of the Cycle V Teacher Corps project, only 17% of the elementary classes (grades 2-6) in project schools had an increase of 0.7 year or more in the total reading achievement mean. But, in the second year of the project this percentage had more than tripled to 54% of the classes (grades) having an increase of 0.7 year or more. The percentage indicating a year or more of growth advanced from only 4% to 18%.

Other advantages resulting either totally or partially from Cycle V Teacher Corps include:

1. A lowered pupil-teacher ratio by using differentiated staffing.
2. More creativity and innovation in the schools due to the wide range of backgrounds of Corpsmen.
3. Decreased vandalism and increased school attendance.
4. Communication improved at all levels of instruction.
5. Increased individualization of instruction.
6. Improved pupil attitudes toward school and self-concepts according to pre and post-test data.
7. Increased special programs for children with special needs, e.g., behavior modification classes, enrichment programs, tutorial and remedial classes.
8. Involvement of parents in making curriculum decisions.
9. Training of teachers to use behavioral objectives.
10. Increased counseling services for pupils.
11. A behavior modification program (Swinging Door) initiated by Cycle V interns to remain in the School System and be expanded.

12. Development of a 10-year plan for spreading team teaching and differentiated staffing in the District.

13. Neighborhood School Boards as an integral part of local school decision-making.

14. Closer communication and cooperation between universities and the School District.

15. Cross-age tutoring established and to be expanded throughout the District.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A major new study of the impact and effectiveness of Teacher Corps was begun in July, 1972. A contract was negotiated between OE and Contemporary Research Incorporated, Los Angeles with System Development Corporation, Los Angeles as sub-contractor. This will be the first comprehensive study to concentrate attention and evaluation on measurement of program performance in terms of the ultimate student performance goal. The study will focus on assessing and analyzing the impact of the program as measured by three major dimensions -- institutional change, enhanced teaching skills and behaviors, and improved classroom learning by students taught by Teacher Corps interns and graduates. Twenty 6th cycle elementary school projects will participate in the study.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual operational data collected by the Teacher Corps Program.

2. United States Office of Education telephone survey of Teacher Corps graduates who completed programs in June 1972.

3. Assessment of the Teacher Corps Program -- Report to the Congress by The Comptroller General of the United States, July 14, 1972.

4. Full-Scale Implementation of a Process Evaluation System for Programs of the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (formerly BEPD) by Resource Management Corporation, December 1, 1972.

5. Louisville, Kentucky Cycle V, Teacher Corps Project -- A Process Evaluation, June, 1971.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Grants Program for Attracting and Qualifying Teachers

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
P.L. 90-35, Section 4, amended by P.L. 90-575, Title I, 1968 Part B, Subpart 2 of the Education Professions Development Act	FY 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$50,000,000	$15,000,000
	1970	65,000,000	15,513,000
	1971	65,000,000	15,000,000
	1972	65,000,000	7,000,000
	1973	0	0

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Part B-2 State Grant Program is to enable States to meet teacher shortages by recruiting and training persons outside the formal education system (from other professions, artisans and craftsmen, former teachers and others) as teachers or aides. Those recruited receive intensive short-term training. All who complete the training are assured a position in a school system where they receive additional on-the-job training. The B-2 program helps link a variety of Office of Education and State personnel development programs, and brings together State Education Agencies, college and universities, local education agencies, and communities on a cooperative basis to work out new kinds of teacher training programs.

The State Grants Program provides grants to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. To date, all 50 States and all Territories with the exception of the Canal Zone have approved State plans. Each State agency identifies its own priorities. for training and within the framework of the Federal guidelines establishes its own criteria for recruitment and standards for training programs. Training projects may be conducted directly by State education agencies or by local school districts who submit proposals for the State allocated funds, singly or in consortia.

The amount of funds allocated to each State is determined by a statutory formula which provides a minimum of $100,000 to each State and the equitable distribution of the remainder of the Congressional appropriation on the basis of the total public and nonpublic elementary and secondary school enrollments. No more than one-third of each State grant may go to support the training of aides.

Because the current teacher surplus has eliminated the need to encourage additional persons to enter the professions, the B-2 Program is being formally terminated on June 30, 1972. The program activity and experience gained with constituencies such as State Departments of Education, institutions of higher education and local education agencies in coordinating a number of Officer of Education funded programs, however, will be merged with the anticipated establishment of local sites for carrying out the new educational renewal strategy.

Data obtained from 45 States showed that 360 projects received FY 1971 funds with a total of 16,168 participants -- 5,331 teachers and 11,131 teacher aides. Of the 360 projects funded:

92 are training personnel in Early Childhood Education
90 are training personnel in Special Education
24 are training personnel for Vocational Education
33 are training personnel for Bilingual Education
121 are training personnel for Reading

Of the 360 projects, 193 or 54 percent, trained personnel to work in schools having a high percentage of students from low income families. Further, the majority of the trainees live in the communities in which these schools are located.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No formal evaluation studies are currently underway. No new studies are planned since the program will soon terminate.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Annual program operations data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Leadership Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$2,739,000
1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	3,900,000
1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	3,900,000
1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D.)	3,900,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Educational Leadership Program supports projects to increase the competence of people who now serve or intend to serve as administrators in elementary or secondary school systems at the local or State level. The primary objectives of the program are:

1. To identify and recruit personnel, especially from new and varied manpower sources, and train them for school administrative positions in inner-city schools and other difficult and challenging settings;

2. To create new or improve existing training programs for administrators which:

   a. reflect cooperative arrangements between local education agencies. Instructions of higher education, and other agencies;

   b. are directed toward new roles for administrators; and

   c. influence change in the regular educational administration program within the university.

3. To train trainers of administrators and other leadership personnel Grants are made to local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and State education agencies.

Individuals who are now administrators or who wish to become administrators in elementary and secondary schools are eligible to participate. An attempt is made to attract promising young people from both educational and noneducational backgrounds. Emphasis is given to recruiting minority participants.

Highest priority is given to projects which seek to improve the quality of education in inner-city schools. The group to be served in this setting is largely comprised of minority groups and other disadvantaged.

In FY 72, the Educational Leadership Program funded 28 projects providing pre-service training to 265 persons and in-service training to an additional 800 persons for a total of 1,131. Over 40 percent of the pre-service participants represented minority groups and most participants were training for positions in inner-city schools.

Program Effectiveness:

In FY 72, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of the 28 projects. It was observed that the major goal of this program is to recruit potential administrators from new and varied manpower sources and to place them in inner-city and other schools having socio-economic characteristics similar to inner-city schools. In both of these aspects, the evaluation revealed that the projects are not meeting program goals. While 60 percent of the participants are members of minority groups, only 12 percent have been recruited from occupational groups outside the field of education. It was also found that 31 percent of the projects have no staff member responsible for assisting participants in job placement.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No major impact evaluation study is planned or underway. This program is to be terminated in FY 1973.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Operational data collected by the Educational Leadership Program. These data are collected annually.

2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Career Opportunities Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$22,217,000
	1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	25,650,000
	1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	27,230,000
	1973	(Total EPDA -- $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D).	24,362,309

Program Purpose and Operations:

The purpose of the Career Opportunities Program (COP) is to improve the education of children from low-income families by:

1. Attracting low-income persons -- including Vietnam veterans -- to new careers in schools serving people from low-income families;
2. Finding better ways of utilizing school staffs for services;
3. Developing training programs for school aide personnel leading to full certification as teachers which combine college level work study and structured career advancement opportunities;
4. Encouraging greater understanding and participation between the community and the education system; and
5. Increasing cooperative relationships between related programs, agencies, and institutions.

Awards are made to local education agencies, which design training programs jointly with community organizations and agencies, community colleges, and nearby universities, and with their State education agencies. The schools subcontract with cooperating institutions of higher education to provide training services. Projects must be located in schools with high concentrations of low-income families.

The Career Opportunities Program encourages low-income men and women to start their careers as education auxiliaries at whatever level their abilities and interests permit, then follow a career lattice to more responsible, more remunerative, and more challenging jobs in low-in-come area schools.

Career Opportunities help school districts and universities create programs that are more relevant to the needs of low-income people and to the career training needs of the participants themselves. Training combines academic study towards high school equivalency, the associate of arts and the baccalaureate degrees, with classroom work in low-in-come area schools supervised by experienced teachers, who serve as team leaders and cooperating teachers. A combination of courses and practicum enable participants to earn 30 credits per calendar year.

The Career Opportunities Program, during FY 72, operated in 132 different project sites. It had 8,000 participants who were working in 1,090 schools affecting approximately 250,845 children from low income areas. Two hundred and ten colleges were involved with COP efforts. Ninety-two percent of the 200 aides who finished college training in FY 1972 were hired as teachers by the school systems where they got their start as aides.

National statistics indicate that:

1. Ninety-six percent of the participants were from areas designated as low-income, up from eighty-four percent the previous year;
2. Ninety-six percent of the participants were residents in the community where they were teaching;
3. Eighty-three percent of the participants were members of a minority group;
4. Eleven-hundred veterans were teaching in classrooms, an increase of three hundred over the previous year; and
5. One hundred and thirty-two school systems have accepted and are employing the auxiliary teacher in the classroom as an additional method of improving the education of children.
6. Through advisory councils (56% minority representation) at local sites parents, community organizations, teachers, businessmen, and university personnel worked on a parity relationship to assess needs that were unique to their locale and employed the COP process as a means for implementing the needed changes.

Program Effectiveness:

A national impact evaluation of COP was conducted by Abt and Associates, Inc. in FY 72. The findings show that the Program is successful when measured by the following impacts:

(1) COP aides are representative of the targeted program population. They show strong motivation to continue in the Program and become teachers, and have a positive professional view of themselves. As such, the Program has provided a vehicle for upward mobility for the aides.

(2) Satisfaction with the Program is high among superintendents, principals, teachers, and COP aides.

(3) Principals want more COP aides in their classrooms and feel that they increase the amount of individual instruction scheduled for children. They perceive COP aides as more professional than other teacher aides.

(4) Superintendents see the COP aides as linkages between their schools and community groups. They want more aides for both regular classes and for special students. There is some evidence supporting less restrictive requirements in the hiring of teachers when COP is in the school system.

(5) Institutions of higher education report changes in course content, schedules, and entrance requirements not only to accommodate COP but also as a result of their COP experiences. These changes, present, planned, or being considered for all students were in the direction of performance based teacher education.

(6) State Education Agencies show a positive relationship between the presence of COP in their schools and changes in credentialing requirements.

There is not yet any evidence showing positive impact on student academic performance and attitudes.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no evaluation projects underway or planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Program operational and fiscal data collected by COP.

2. Impact Evaluation of the Career Opportunities Program by Abt and Associates, Inc., January 1, 1973.

3. COP Project, Richmond, California Unified School District.

4. Project COP, Division of Research, Memphis City Schools Memphis, Tennessee.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Early Childhood Program

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531 Education Professions Development Act	FY 1976

Funding History:	**Year**	**Authorization**	**Appropriation**
	1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$4,778,000
	1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	5,900,000
	1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	5,900,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D)	755,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Early Childhood Program supports projects to train and retrain personnel for programs for young children ages 3-9. The primary objectives of the program are to increase the supply of qualified teacher trainers, supervisors, curriculum and evaluation specialists, teachers and aides in early childhood education and to improve the quality of training programs for these personnel. Grants are provided to institutions of higher education, local education agencies and State Education agencies for institutes or fellowships or combined programs.

In fiscal year 1972, the Early Childhood Program funded 35 projects serving 4,037 educational personnel of whom 1,048 were teacher aides, 2,084 were teachers, and 905 were teacher trainers and trainers and teacher trainers combined.

In FY 1972, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of 35 projects. The key observations made in this study are:

(1) this program has an extensive, well-developed set of program conditions to guide projects in the field.

(2) project performance is good, in general, although it appears low in many cases because of the high goals set.

(3) project self-evaluation is strong and most projects have begun to incorporate successful project features into regular programs of colleges and/or school districts.

(4) overall areas of weakness may be found in community involvement and in the post-training plans of participants.

(5) while community representatives are involved in most projects, the involvement is at a fairly low level, with few projects utilizing their input for the training or assessment of participants or in formal project evaluation activities.

(6) with the training program designed to fill the critical shortages in the early childhood education field, only 43.9 percent of the participants (1,512) expect to be employed as teachers in pre-school through grade 3 on completion of project training.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected studies are currently planned for this area. Each project is required to have an internal evaluation component.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Operational data collected by the Early Childhood Program. Data are collected annually.

2. The Plus in Education -- An Evaluation of Project TECT and KET.

3. Summative Evaluation -- A program to provide for coordination of training of workers in early childhood education.

4. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by the Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Personnel Utilization Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$ 90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$4,039,000
1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	3,000,000
1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	3,000,000
1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D.)	300,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The goal of the School Personnel Utilization Program is to encourage adoption of differentiated staffing patterns in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. The following objectives relate to attainment of this overall goal:

1. To train educational personnel for new and differentiated staffing patterns which include the following elements:
    a. differentiated functions of all school personnel including teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals;
    b. differentiated salaries according to functions and roles;
    c. flexible instructional time schedules;
    d. differentiated instructional modes.
2. To improve the managerial, organizational, instructional and technological skills and attitudes of professional personnel by operationally defining the skills relative to the particular staffing pattern and training for them.

3. To bring about changes in student attitude and changes in achievement in those specific instructional areas for which differentiated staffing patterns are to be employed.

4. To increase the understanding, support, and participation of the community in the educational system.

5. To increase understanding, support, and participation in other schools within the system.

6. To encourage State education agencies to consider alternatives for utilizing certified and non-certified personnel and to encourage flexible credentialing practices.

7. To promote participation of local teacher organizations in major decisions.

8. To encourage universities to make changes in in-service and pre-service programs.

Grants are made to institutions of higher education and State and local education agencies.

In 1972, the SPU program had 20 projects involving 5,415 participants.

During FY 71, the Evaluation Training Center at Florida State University: (1) developed a graduate training program in the evaluation of SPU programs; (2) analyzed and revised SPU Program Objectives; (3) developed instruments and procedures and the subsequent training of project evaluators required to assess the impact of the SPU Programs; (4) developed a comprehensive model for evaluating SPU Programs; and (5) performed extensive field testing of the evaluation model on a selected sample of projects. The report on the evaluation of SPU projects is expected in FY 1973.

In 1972, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of 16 projects. It was observed that the differentiated staffing approach of this program is well underway in most of the 16 projects. Most of the preliminary steps have been completed by the projects with the total implementation of new staff roles and patterns and a new augmented salary structure yet to come. Fifty percent of the funds required in project operations were derived from non-NCIES sources. The fiscal year 1972 was the first year of development for the projects. Sixty-eight percent of the projects reported the primary problems encountered were teacher anxiety and fatigue. All projects reported that the differentiated staffing model has highlighted the need for other educational changes in their respective school systems.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An Evaluation of School Personnel Utilization Projects by the Evaluation Training Center at Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data
2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December, 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Education

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Parts C, D, and F
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$6,992,000
	1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	6,900,000
	1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	6,900,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D).	3,943,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Exception Children Program is to train regular classroom teachers and other educational personnel to meet the needs of handicapped children in regular classrooms. Primary objectives are:

1. To increase the number of regular educational personnel who understand and can deal effectively with handicapped children in regular classroom particularly leadership personnel such as deans of education, school superintendents, principals, and State education agency administrators who are capable of significantly influencing other personnel or programs;

2. To train teacher trainers so that they can integrate special education effectively into regular teacher preparation programs;

3. To encourage training institutions to modify existing preparation programs so that regular teabhers and other educational personnel will be more capable of working with handicapped children in the regular classrooms;

4. To provide training in the techniques of special education for personnel such as school administrators, school psychologists, counselors, educational media specialists who are or will be responsible for educating the handicapped in the regular classroom, and teacher aides for both regular and special education classrooms; and

5. To encourage the development of training projects that address the needs of handicapped children in poverty population, both urban and rural.

Grants are made to institutions of higher education and State and local education agencies.

In 1972 29 projects, addressed to children from minority groups and/or children from poverty situations, were funded by the Exceptional Children Program. Training was provided for approximately 3500 educational personnel 2000 of whom were classroom teachers. The remainder of 1500 were comprised of administrators, trainers of teachers and teacher aides. Approximately 50 percent of the participants were non-Whites representing Blacks, Chicanos, and American Indians.

In 1972, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of 39 projects. The overall conclusion of this study is that the major goal of the Special Education Program -- the training of teachers to teach handicapped children in regular classroom settings -- is being met by most of the projects studied. Academic and practicum training are directed to this end, emphasizing identification, diagnosis, and remediation for handicapped children. No major problem areas were cited by participants and there were no frequently mentioned suggestions for project improvement. Self-evaluation of projects is well underway, with most projects having established measurable objectives for the evaluation.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected studies are currently planned for this area. There are no major studies underway; nevertheless, each project is required to have an internal evaluation component.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual site visits

2. Annual review by the University of Minnesota Leadership Training Institute

3. Quarterly and yearly reports

4. Review of 1971-72 projects by the University of Minnesota Leadership Training Institute.

5. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Education Personnel Development, December 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Training of Teacher Trainers Program

Legislation: **Expiration Date:**

P.L. 90-35, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$102,750,000	$62,647,000
	1967	226,250,000	70,250,000
	1968	354,750,000	75,250,000
	1969	300,000,000	80,000,000
	1970	340,000,000	13,280,000
	1971	340,000,000	12,200,000
	1972		10,000,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D.)	10,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Trainers of Teacher Trainers Program (TTT) supports training projects for teacher trainers and trainers of teacher trainers in institutions of higher education and in local and State education agencies. The primary objectives of the program are to identify, recruit, and train qualified persons to be teacher trainers and trainers of teacher trainers to increase the competency of personnel now functioning in these positions and to improve the quality of preservice and inservice training for personnel in these positions, and to incorporate changes for improvement into the regular system of preservice and inservice training.

Grants are made to local and State education agencies and institutions of higher education for combined short-term and long-term training activities.

Participants include university or school personnel responsible for the preparation or leadership of teacher trainers, as well as prospective trainers. Other school or college personnel who serve on clinical teams or whose training provides practicum experience for teacher trainers or trainers of teacher trainers also participate.

In FY 1972, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of 29 projects involving directly and indirectly approximately 10,000 persons. Representation included administrators, faculty and students in institutions of higher education and local and State education agencies. Paraprofessionals and members of the community also participated in TTT activities. It was observed that the TTT Program has done much toward bringing a number of groups together to enhance the re-training of college teachers. Participants see the lack of communication between groups, e.g., schools, community and the institution of higher education as the major problem facing the Program. Advisory councils appear to be fairly strong, providing guidance to projects in planning and operations. The multiplier effect desired by the Program appears to be weak, with less than 50 percent of the projects having a staff member responsible for the formal dissemination of project information.

During FY 1972 the Evaluation Research Center, University of Virginia required projects to submit documentary evidence of the success of all planned institutional outcomes and of the most important individual outcomes. There were reported a total of 692 changes, 583 institutional and 109 individual, documented by 2,556 pieces of evidence, which included private documents, proceedings of meetings, technical and project reports, narrative descriptions of activities, and published reports in newspapers and magazines. Eighty-nine percent of the evidence appeared to be fact rather than opinion, and slightly over one-half of the evidence provided strong support for the stated change variable.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

During FY 73, documentary evidence supporting institutional and individual changes will continue to be collected by the Evaluation Research Center, University of Virginia. There will also be several in-depth studies of selected components of TTT describing the strategies employed to effect the same change, for example parity, the alternative doctorate, practicums for graduate university faculty.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Report on the Collection of Documentary Evidence of Outcomes of the TTT Program. September 1972, Evaluation Research Center, University of Virginia.

2. Full-Scale Implementation of a Process Evaluation System for Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development. November 1972, Resource Management Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland, Volume 1. Summary.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Pupil Personnel Services Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531 Education Professions Development Act	FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$3,859,000
	1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	4,900,000
	1972	90,000,000	4,900,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D.)	2,180,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The goal of the program is to improve the quality of education for low-achieving students from families of low-income by providing entry and practicing pupil personnel service workers with interdisciplinary training coupled with practicum experience.

The specific objectives are:

1. To improve qualifications of trainers and supervisors of pupil personnel specialists;
2. To develop alternative manpower development models;
3. To recruit and train minority group members as pupil personnel specialists; and
4. To bring about organizational change in both the training institutions and in schools where pupil personnel specialists function.

Projects include training in the following fields:

1. Guidance services, including counseling;
2. Psychological services, including school psychology, psychiatric, and other mental health services;
3. Social services, including school social work, attendance work, and visiting teacher services; and
4. Health services, including the teacher (or school) nurse, physician, and dental hygienist.

Projects may be short (usually no less than 6 weeks total) or long (as much as two summers and the intervening academic year). Although summer training projects are usually full time, any project may call for either full- or part-time participation or a combination of these.

In FY 72, grants were made to 9 institutions of higher education to provide training for trainers of pupil personnel workers as well as prospective and experienced pupil personnel specialists at the pre-school and elementary levels. A total of 800 such personnel participated in these programs. Also in FY 1972, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of the 9 projects. It was observed that this program has done a good job in terms of projects achieving program objectives. Minority group members have been recruited (73 percent of all participants), involvement of the projects in low-income communities is extensive, and training activities are comprehensive in nature. Weaknesses do exist, however, in project management and in assuring that successful project features are implemented outside the project.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected impact studies are currently planned for this area. Information is being gathered by historian-observers on each center/satellite project's material and inter-institutional relationships and the specific instances of change due to this program. Data from this effort should be availabe in FY 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data
2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

3. Summative Evaluation -- A program to provide for coordination of training of workers in early childhood education.

4. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by the Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Urban/Rural School Development Program

Legislation: | **Expiration Date:**

P.L. 90-35, 1967 Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	(Obligated) Appropriation
	1971	$ 90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$ 9,300,000
	1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	8,600,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D)	7,570,835

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Urban/Rural School Development Program is designed to bring about enriched learning opportunities for students in schools serving a high concentration of low-income families. Its basic purpose is to produce -- (over the life of a five-year project) -- accelerated classroom academic achievement, improved affective development, and increased range of opportunities for students. Through a strategy of close school-community collaboration, the program concentrates on the following intermediate objectives:

1. To make training for educational personnel more responsive to the needs of the school, its staff, its pupil population, and the community by means of concentrating training and program development resources in a single school or in a limited number of related schools;

2. To develop improved decision-making capabilities in school and community personnel;

3. To develop within the school and community a continuous process for identifying critical needs and assembling ideas, resources, and strategies to meet those needs; and

4. To effect a process through which the individual school and its community accepts responsibility for its decision, and is accountable for its actions regarding the utilization of resources, formulation of strategies and development of a program to improve pupil performance.

Local education agencies are the usual grantees.

Educational personnel normally employed in participating schools (teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors, principals, etc.) receive training, and implement curricular and organizational reforms.

Program Effectiveness:

During FY 1972, all projects were continued as a result of the effectiveness of their organizational, needs assessment, planning for training programs, and, in every instance, the implementation of such training programs. A conservative count of 3700 individuals were subjected to formal training activities. This figure include school staffs and community persons directly associated with the program including council members. Although mostly subjective, evidence thus far indicates a positive impact from the program, especially in the affective domain.

In FY 72, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of 13 projects. The findings revealed a few areas of concern that need to be addressed even though the Program has had roughly one year of operation. One area of concern is that no project among the 13 projects studied has taken any steps to budget for project continuation by phasing out Federal funds. Another concern is that only 31 percent of the projects studied have taken steps to incorporate successful project features into regular programs of the school district and/or the college. This finding raises a question about the potential impact of the Urban-Rural Program on educational system change. The training programs offered by the projects studied are not extensive -- only 46, 38, and 69 percent of them offered academic, practicum, or other training, respectively. Finally, less than 55 percent of the participants indicated that the projects had caused them to do things differently.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

On-going and Planned Evaluation Studies:

All projects are currently engaged in evaluation activity and by June 1973 it is anticipated that a reliable impact evaluation of the program's effect upon children's learning and behavior will be available.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual programs operations data
2. National and Regional Conferences
3. Reports from LTI Regional Coordinators
4. Program officer site visits.
5. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by the Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Teacher Training in Developing Institutions Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531 Education Professions Development Act	FY 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$ 90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$ 9,466,000
	1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	4,900,000
	1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	4,900,000
	1973		Decision pending

I. Program Purpose:

The broad purposes of the Teacher Training in Developing institutions (TTDI) Program are: (1) to effect sound reform and to encourage the use of innovative practices in the teacher training programs in developing institutions and (2) to provide advanced specialty and predoctoral training for educational personnel who have been or may be displaced or adversely affected by the school desegregation process. TTDI is a project grant program and embraces in its activies both a developmental and service thrust.

During the 1971-72 period 35 institutes were held during the summer, 1971, which enrolled 1,250 participants or a mean of 37 per institute. There were 24 percent males and 76 percent females and 23 percent Blacks and 27 percent Whites. Among the participants, 58 percent taught in elementary school, 34 percent in secondary school, and 38 percent in pre-kindergarten, college, or a adult teaching. The participants taught a total of 79,358 pupils. The summer institute staff was

> 244 or 7.3 per institution, the majority (75 percent) of whom were professionals. Racially, the staff included 57 percent Blacks and 43 percent Whites with men and women equally represented. Seventy-three percent of the staff members held professional rank and 53.7 percent held the doctoral degree. Approximately 71.2 percent of the staff had experience teaching in the public schools, while 95.6 percent had prior experience in higher education.
>
> During the academic year, there were 38 institutes enrolling 1,269 participants or a mean of 33 per institution. The sex, ethnic distribution, and educational level of the academic year participants were comparable to the summer institute group. The academic year enrollees taught a total of 76,780 pupils, the majority of whom were enrolled in junior and senior high schools. The project staffs were comparable to the summer staffs during this period, but generally were part-time with the institute during the academic year component.

An evaluation carried out by the Human Affairs Research Center looked at 38 TDDI projects during 1971-72. An overall assessment and a detailed analysis of all projects were undertaken through site visits and observations along with participant questionnaire data.

Employing a set of systematic criteria 16 percent of the projects were judged significantly effective, 42 percent were judged very effective, 42 percent were judged effective.

A total of 580 of the 1280 summer participants responded to the questionnaire representing a 46 percent return. The vast majority of these improved skills in the preparation of teaching materials, improved ability to communicate with persons of racial groups other than their own and improved ability to develop and implement effective teaching strategies.

The main thrust of the Teacher Training in Developing Institutes program is to strengthen developing institutions, predominantly Black, in such a way as to enable them to more effectively deliver quality teacher training programs as well as to implement strategies for educational reform.

In FY 72, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of 39 projects in the programs The findings reveal that the participants are satisfied with the TDDI program. Eighty-six percent of the participants in the 39 projects studied indicated that the project was meeting their expectations and there was no discernible trend concerning the weakest or poorest project feature. This satisfaction may be short-lived, however, since only 30 percent of the projects have a staff member responsible for providing placement assistance to participants.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected studies are currently planned for this area. There are no major studies underway.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data
2. An evaluation of the 1971-72 Teacher Training in Developing Institutions Program - The Human Affairs Research Center, New York, New York.
3. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education Personnel Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part F, Secs. 552 & 553
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$35,000,000 (Part F)	$ 5,698,000
1971	40,000,000 "	6,900,000
1972	45,000,000	6,900,000
1973	50,000,000 (Est. amt)	11,800,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The goal of the Vocational Education Personnel Program is to provide State and local career education leaders with the capability for developing a systems approach to professional personnel development which is responsive to local needs and which will effect improved preparation of education personnel at institutions of higher education. The enabling objectives are 1) to initiate cooperative arrangements between State and local education to ensure the adequate preparation and development of professional personnel for career and vocational education; 2) to improve the quality and effectiveness of the instruction and administration of existing career and vocational programs; and 3) to continue support for the revision and refinement of the States systems for professional personnel development in career and vocational education.

The Vocational Education Personnel Program provides opportunities for State boards for vocational education and institutions of higher education to train and retrain experienced vocational education personnel and other personnel in order to strengthen vocational education programs and the administration of schools offering these programs. This is accomplished through grants that are awarded to States according to the degree to which they have developed a statewide plan for professional personnel development in vocational education.

The Leadership Development Program, which grants awards to institutions of higher education for the development of new and innovative programs at the leadership level, has been the second component of the Vocational

Education Personnel Program. The doctoral component of this program is currently being phased out.

In addition, the purpose of this program under Part D of the Education Professions Development Act is to provide project grants and developmental assistance to State education agencies, local education agencies and institutions of higher education to orient or reorient nonvocational personnel to include career development aspects in all of their instructional programs. The target population of both Part F and Part D includes career development aspects in all of their instructional programs. The target population of both Part F and Part D includes all levels of educational personnel including para-professionals. The scope of the program is indicated by the following:

1. Forty-eight States including Puerto Rico, Samoa and the Trust territories have now designed and implemented a comprehensive systems approach to the initial and continuing development of vocational education personnel.

2. Eash State agency has established at the State-level a specific unit with responsibility for determining professional personnel needs on a Statewide basis; for planning, coordinating; and funding programs to meet those needs; and for monitoring and maintaining a continuous assessment and evaluation of the State system for Vocational education personnel development.

3. Approximately 150 training programs involving participants from all service areas have been supported with a resulting reduction of fragmentation in the field and a more comprehensive approach to teacher education and local program operation.

4. At least 48 States and six territories are now making special efforts to bring State and local education agencies and institutions of higher education together for a more coordinated and concerned effort in developing and expanding vocational education to meet the needs of each State.

5. Approximately 20 States have conducted in-service training in management by objectives for all of their State-staff plus some local administrative personnel.

6. Approximately 10 States are re-evaluating their certification requirements for vocational education personnel and are beginning to relate them to competency-based criteria.

7. Approximately 20 States are now involving the business-industry complex in the development of their career and vocational education personnel.

8. Special projects in approximately 12 States have trained educational personnel for implementing the career education concept at the local level.

9. Special projects have been supported in approximately 20 States to develop among vocational educators a better understanding of the needs and characteristics of both underprivileged and handicapped youth.

10. Eighteen universities are receiving assistance in implementing comprehensive leadership development programs at the doctoral level to supply high-level leadership personnel for career and vocational education. Currently, there are 216 Federally supported, and 48 State supported participants enrolled in doctoral programs of these universities. Federal funding level for this program is 1.9 million.

11. Activities supported through the States during FY 71 and the approximate percentages of total funding for each category include: (1) in-service programs for increasing the competencies to teachers, administrators, and support personnel (45%); training in-service teachers to work with disadvantaged and handicapped youth (21%); exchange of education-industrial personnel (9%); developing teachers for career education (6%); and recruitment and training of teachers from other fields for vocational education (19%).

12. Approximately 15 States supported projects relative to the development of counseling and guidance personnel with occupational awareness and knowledge of the utilization of occupational information for placement.

Current plans are to continue the present emphasis on the development, implementation, evaluation and improvement of comprehensive statewide systems for vocational education. There will be continued assistance to States to enable them to meet some of their more critical, high priority needs for personnel development. Special efforts will be made to initiate basis reform in teacher education institutions by supporting the development of quality education components in their regular teacher education curricula and by instituting special efforts to upgrade their vocational teacher education programs.

The purpose of the Vocational Education 553 Program is to permit cooperation between Federal and State governments in meeting local needs for vocational education. This cooperation takes the form of the States identifying the projects and the Federal government providing the funds because only 41 percent of projects utilized non-NCIES funds. While both the Program and NCIES place great emphasis on the development of sensitivity to low-income and handicapped children, only 56 and 37 percent, respectively, of the projects studied (51 projects) focus on either area as a project goal. The projects are attempting to develop specific skills in participants (basically current vocational education personnel) and to introduce new teaching methods.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Ohio State University is currently developing an evaluation system for vocational education leadership and development activities for all State programs. It is anticipated that the system will be flexible enough to adapt the evaluation needs of each State. After completion of this developmental effort it is anticipated that training of State leadership will be conducted in the interests of implementing the model.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data

2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

3. An Evaluation System for Vocational Education Leadership and Professional Development Activities Ohio State University.

F. Library Programs

1. Library Services
2. Public Library Construction
3. Interlibrary Cooperative Services
4. Academic Library Resources
5. Career Training - Libraries
6. Library Demonstrations
7. School Library Resources
8. Undergraduate Instructional Equipment
9. Equipment and Minor Remodeling

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Library Services

Legislation:

Library Services and Construction Act, Title I, as amended by P.L. 91-600 and Title IV-A and IV-B

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
Beginning in 1972, State Institutionalized Services (Title IV-A) and Services to the Physically Handicapped (Title IV-B) were combined under Title I.	1965	$ 25,000,000	$ 25,000,000
	1966	25,000,000	25,000,000
	1967	35,000,000	35,000,000
	1968	45,000,000	35,000,000
	1969	55,000,000	35,000,000
	1970	65,000,000	29,750,000
	1971	75,000,000	35,000,000
	1972	112,000,000	46,000,000
	1973	117,000,000	30,000,000
(Old Title IV-A)			
	1967	5,000,000	$ 350,000
	1968	7,500,000	2,120,000
	1969	10,000,000	2,094,000
	1970	12,500,000	2,094,000
	1971	15,000,000	2,094,000
	1972	See above	See above
(Old Title IV-B			
	1967	3,000,000	250,000
	1968	4,000,000	1,320,000
	1969	5,000,000	1,334,000
	1970	6,000,000	1,334,000
	1971	7,000,000	1,334,000
	1972	See above	See above

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides support to States through basic and matching formula grants to assist them in providing library services to areas without such services or areas with inadequate services; to assist in improving quality of information services including services to specialized groups such as the disadvantaged, the physically handicapped, and those in public institutions; to strengthen public library administration at the State level; to strengthen metropolitan public libraries which serve as national or regional resource centers; and to plan programs and projects to extend and improve service.

The Federal share ranges from 33% to 66% except for the Trust Territory which is 100% Federally funded, and States must match in proportion to their per capita income. States must maintain the same level of fiscal effort for handicapped and institutionalized library service that existed prior to the combination of these programs under the new amendments.

General data for the current programs are as follows:	1972 Actual
1. Population with access to LSCA services (in thousand)	87,000
2. Disadvantaged persons with access to LSCA services (in thousand)	23,500
3. Number of State institutionalized persons served by LSCA	302,000
4. Number of handicapped persons served by LSCA	70,000
5. Number of books purchased (in thousand)	7,900
6. Number of Right-to-Read projects supported by LSCA	65
7. Number of Drug Abuse projects supported by LSCA	112
8. Number of Environmental Education projects supported by LSCA	56

Program Effectiveness:

The first study of the impact of Title I services, covering the period from 1964 to 1968, was made by the System Development Corporation. In reviewing the LSCA activities in 11 States it found that most projects felt handicapped by: lack of manpower; lack of coordination among public libraries and other educational agencies; need for research in determining whether "disadvantaged projects" were reaching their goals; lack of understanding on the part of the public of the library's potential and actual services; lack of ability of libraries to react quickly to public demands for more services; and lack of suitable measurements of library performances.

The Behavioral Science Corporation study identified, field visited, and evaluated public library service to the disadvantaged in selected cities. These projects were not limited, however, to Title I projects. This pilot study of 15 local library projects for the urban disadvantaged, utilizing user and non-user interviewers for evaluation, recommended that libraries find better ways to coordinate with schools when dealing with disadvantaged children. The successful programs were characterized by the inclusion of some or all of the following: active participation by the target group; emphasis on audio-visual rather than print materials; and the fact that the program had been viewed as a significant service by the adults in the community.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There is an ongoing major evaluation study to determine how the Library Service and Construction Act, Titles I & II is meeting the public library needs of special clientele groups, e.g. disadvantaged, ethnic minorities, handicapped, and institutionalized persons. The project has surveyed all State Library Agencies, all known ongoing projects directed toward these groups, and discontinued projects. Fifty-five representative sites were field visited and library and related agency personnel were interviewed as well as library users and non-users. This study will provide an inventory of projects, a needs assessment, and recommendations for change. Over 1600 projects were identified and queried. This number more than doubled the expected amount. Preliminary indications revealed the importance of inter-organizational cooperation and program personnel. It was found that many projects classified as discontinued (due to the loss of LSCA funding) were operational, but being funded from State or local monies. A methodology specifying criteria to adjudge program effectiveness was developed, and was tested and validated with the examined projects. This project is expected to be completed by January 1973. The study is supplemented by the results of library Demonstration/Research Projects which surveyed and analyzed the library services to the Spanish Americans of the Southwest, the American Indian, the aging, and the urban poor.

A major analysis of the Federal role in the support of public libraries was begun in FY 1972. This study is assessing the current total national public library situation utilizing existing data and will include recommendations for further data collection efforts in areas of current information deficiencies.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Overview of LSCA Title I, by System Development Corporation, Published by Bowker.

2. A Study of Public Library Service to the Disadvantaged in Selected Cities, by Claire Lipsman and contracted to Behavioral Science Corporation.

3. Study of Exemplary Public Library Reading and Reading Related Programs for Children, Youth and Adults, by Barss, Reitzel & Assoc. Inc.

4. Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups, by System Development Corporation. To be completed January, 1973.

5. The Public Library and Federal Policy - Phase I by Systems Development Corporation. To be completed April, 1973.

6. Various Library Demonstration Projects: These projects are designed to survey and analyze the public library and information services to the Spanish Americans of the Southwest, the American Indian, the aging, and the information needs of the urban poor.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Public Library Construction

Legislation:

Library Services and Construction Act,
Title II, as amended by P.L. 91-600

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$ 30,000,000	$ 30,000,000
	1966	30,000,000	30,000,000
	1967	40,000,000	40,000,000
	1968	50,000,000	21,185,000
	1969	60,000,000	9,185,000
	1970	70,000,000	7,807,250
	1971	80,000,000	7,092,500
	1972	80,000,000	9,500,000
	1973	84,000,000	- 0 - 1/

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds to States on a matching basis to support the construction of public libraries. Funds may be used for the construction of new buildings, for additions to existing buildings and for rennovation or alteration of existing buildings or for the acquistion of an existing facility to be used for public library purposes. Grants are made to States on a formula basis. The Federal share ranges from 33% to 66%, except for the Trust Territory which is 100% Federally funded and States must match in proportion to their per capita income. The long-range objective is to achieve total State and local support for public library construction without Federal funds.

Program Effectiveness:

From the program's inception in 1965 through 1972, 1,810 projects totaling $157,074,000 have been supported adding more than 20 million square feet of floor space. State and local agencies will have contributed approximately $380,000,000 in support of these projects. About 1.2 million square feet of new or rennovated public library floor space has been added in 1973.

1/ Approximately $3 million will be available as a carryover from FY 1972.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study being conducted by the System Development Corporation to examine public library service for special clientele groups will, among other things, review and analyze how Title II construction funds have been used to purchase new facilities or to provide renovated facilities for projects aimed at special target groups.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of Library Services and Construction Act Services to Specialized Target Groups, by System Development Corporation. To be completed January 1973.

2. Program Operational Data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Interlibrary Cooperative Services

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Library Services and Construction Act, Title III, as amended by P.L. 91-600	FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1967	$ 5,000,000	$ 375,000
	1968	7,500,000	2,375,000
	1969	10,000,000	2,281,000
	1970	12,500,000	2,281,000
	1971	15,000,000	2,281,000
	1972	15,000,000	2,634,500
	1973	15,750,000	2,730,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds through formula grants to States to establish and maintain local, regional, State or interstate cooperative networks of libraries for the coordination of informational services of school, public, academic, and special libraries and information centers, permitting the user of any one type of library to draw on all libraries and information centers. No State matching is required. In 1972, 120 cooperative projects were supported, an increase of sixteen over fiscal year 1971. Over 8,700 libraries were involved in these projects, an increase of approximately 1,600 over the previous year. Participation by all classes of libraries in telecommunications or information processing systems has increased.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation studies are currently underway in this area. No such studies are planned.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Program Operational Data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Academic Library Resources

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-A

Expiration Date:

1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 50,000,000	$ 10,000,000
1967	50,000,000	25,000,000
1968	50,000,000	25,000,000
1969	25,000,000	25,000,000
1970	75,000,000	9,816,000
1971	90,000,000	9,900,000
1972	90,000,000	10,944,000
1973	75,000,000	12,466,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds to institutions of higher education to assist and encourage them in the acquisition of library materials -- books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials. Three types of grants are awarded to eligible institutions of higher education: (1) Basic grants up $5,000 which must be matched dollar for dollar; (2) Supplemental grants up to $20 per student with no matching required; and (3) Special purpose grants which must be matched with $1 institution for every $3 Federal money.

Beginning in 1971 the funds were redirected through revision of the guidelines to support developing and new institutions such as community colleges, vocational technical institutes, those institutions with high incidences of low-income students and those institutions sharing their resources with schools with more limited collections.

The 1971 redirection of the program to needy institutions resulted in the reduction of the number of grants from over 2,000 to 1056 in 1972. Five hundred and four basic and four hundred and ninety four supplemental grants were awarded in fiscal year 1972 to those institutions of higher education in direst need. In addition, 58 special purpose grants provided support to institutions with programs which share their resources with needy institutions. Included in these grants are 95 directed toward predominantly black colleges and universities totaling nearly $1.9 million.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness, has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program. There are no evaluation studies planned for this area in the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Operational Data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Career Training - Libraries

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-B

Expiration Date:

1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization*	Appropriation
1966	$ 15,000,000	$ 1,000,000
1967	15,000,000	3,750,000
1968	15,000,000	8,250,000
1969	11,800,000	8,250,000
1970	28,000,000	6,833,000
1971	38,000,000	3,900,000
1972	38,000,000	1,939,000
1973	15,000,000	3,558,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides project grants to institutions of higher education to support training and retraining of librarians and information scientists, including paraprofessionals, for service in all types of libraries and information centers. In the past professional training was accomplished through institutes and post-graduate degree granting fellowships. Now this is to be accomplished through long- and short-term institutes only, phasing out the fellowship program after 1972 when all current fellowship grantees will have completed their studies.

However, the Education Amendments of 1972 effective July 1, 1972 require that not less than 50 percent of the funds for library training be used to support fellowships and traineeships. In addition the amendments now require a statutory distribution of funds between the college library resources, and the training and research programs. Of the amount appropriated for library research and training under Title II-B, 66-2/3 percent must be used for library training.

---

*Combined authorization with Library Research and Demonstration until FY 1972.

Between 1966 and 1970 the program awarded 2,337 graduate fellowships and provided institute training funds for 6,532 participants. In 1971, the program was redirected to provide more responsive library services to disadvantaged and minority groups by retraining librarians and training members of minority and disadvantaged groups so that they might enter into the library profession as professionals and/or para-professional. The primary focus of this redirection was to achieve change in the system for preparation and utilization of library manpower to be more responsive to the informational needs of the disadvantaged. A total of 47 short- and long-term institutes involving about 700 participants were funded in fiscal year 1972.

Also 20 individuals completed the third year of a three year traineeship program, resulting in the award of a Master of Library Science degree. The fellowship program was limited to 42 continuing doctoral candidates. For FY 1972, the average cost per participant was about $8,400 for those in the fellowship program, and about $6,500 for persons in long term institutes and, $63 for each participant in short term institutes.

Program Effectiveness:

Two formal evaluation studies of this program have been made. The first in FY 1969 by the Bureau of Social Science which was restricted to the fellowship program. It found at that time that all 3 types of graduate support (the masters, post masters and PhD. programs) were accomplishing their intended goals; however, the study indicated that the master's program was most effective out of the three studies for bringing in new personnel to library areas outside of the academic library field. These findings were utilized but consistent with the Office of Education focus on the disadvantaged, institute training seems more effective than fellowships. The second study was performed by Rutgers University and examined the institute program. Interviews were conducted with institute directors, Regional Program Officers, and the staff from the library bureau. The directors identified the following areas of concern: proposal negotiations; participant selection; and timing as it relates to proposal preparation, award, and implementation. It was found that the area of greatest institute impact is in the area of school media personnel. Existing institute evaluation methods were indicated as an area in need of improvement.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no evaluation studies planned for this area in the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Overview of the Library Fellowship Program by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. of Washington, D.C.
2. Data Collection and Description of HEA Title II-B Institutes, by Rutgers.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Library Demonstrations

Legislation:

Legislative Authorization for Library Research -- Higher Education Act of 1965 Title II-B

Expiration Date:

FY 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1967	(See library training authorization)	$3,500,000
	1968		3,500,000
	1969		2,000,000
	1970		2,100,000
	1971		2,171,000
	1972		2,000,000
	1973		1,785,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds through grants and contracts with public and private institutions for demonstration projects relating to the improvement of library and information services.

The program was redirected in 1971 to focus support on improving services to the disadvantaged. In 1972, 22 projects were funded. Of these 5 are continuations of previously awarded projects and 17 new starts. One of the refunded projects is the community learning center, in Philadelphia to service elementary and secondary school students and their parents in a large low-income, inner-city area. New projects concern a variety of library and library related areas, such as; "Minority Program Development for Libraries and Learning Resources," "The Interrelating of Library and Basic Education Services for Disadvantaged Adults", "Identification of Informational Needs of the American Indian Community that can be met by Library Service," and the "Identification and Coordination of African-American Materials in six Southeastern States." One of the newly funded project in FY 1972 is a proposal to research and design criteria for the implementation and establishment of a neighborhood information center in five public libraries in five cities; Atlanta, Cleveland, Detroit, Houston and Queens, N.Y. The project enables directors of five major public libraries to designate a co-ordinator and supporting staff to conduct a feasibility study, Phase I, for the purpose of researching the planning for a neighborhood information center in a branch library. Phase II supports an overall planning study to provide criteria and broad guidelines for a neighborhood information center in the five cities. Phase III is the implementation phase based upon research and recommendations derived from Phases I and II. Research will indicate type of information center desirable, type of staff, type of co-ordination, type of materials needed, type of equipment, scope of the problem, population to be served, hours of opening, current existing information available, activities of other agencies, desirability of computerizing information, type of advisory council to be appointed, and its responsibilities. Research will indicate similarities, differences in five cities, provide basis for guidelines for current and future planning in these and other cities.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program. No such studies are planned for the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Studies:

None

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Library Resources

Legislation:	**Expiration Date**
Title II of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10)	June 1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 100,000,000	$ 100,000,000
1967	125,000,000	102,000,000
1968	150,000,000	104,000,000
1969	162,500,000	50,000,000
1970	200,000,000	42,500,000
1971	200,000,000	80,000,000
1972	210,000,000	89,999,000
1973	220,000,000	90,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of ESEA Title II is to provide school library resources, textbooks, periodicals, audio-visual materials, and other instructional materials for use in public and private elementary and secondary schools.

To apply for its allotment, each State or similar jurisdiction submits a plan for the operation of the Title II program to the U.S. Office of Education. The State plan must, among other requirements, provide for the distribution of materials on the basis of need, assure that materials will be provided on an equitable basis for the use of children and teachers in private schools, and assure that Federal funds will be used to supplement rather than supplant other programs serving the purpose of this title. No matching of Federal funds is required; however, current levels of State local and private schools expenditures for like purpose must be maintained. Local school districts apply for funds to the State Education Agency in accordance with procedures set forth in the approved State plan. On the basis of comparative analysis and the application of standards, the State department determines from time to time the relative need of children and teachers for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials available under Title II.

The Title II program consists of two components--acquisition of materials and administration. The acquisition program includes the purchase, lease-purchase, or straight lease of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials. It also includes the necessary costs of ordering, processing, and cataloging such materials and delivery of them to the initial place at which they are made available for use. Administration includes those executive, supervisory, and management responsibilities vested in the State agency and necessary to carry out State plans. Five percent of the total amount made available to the State under Title II, or $50,000, whichever is greater, is allowed for administration of the State Plan.

Program Effectiveness:

Information about this program comes primarily from two surveys of local education agencies; a survey carried out in FY 1968 which collected financial data as well as other descriptive data and a survey in FY 1970 (Consolidated Program Information Report) which focused upon financial and pupil participation data. Among the more important findings of the surveys are that much of the money (64%) is used to acquire printed materials (other than textbooks), that most of the expenditures (78%) focused on the general elementary and secondary population, that the number of program beneficiaries from non-public schools is proportional to the enrollment in non-public schools (about 10% of the total in each case) and that the program has stimulated State and local support for school library resources and other instructional materials.

Preliminary 1972 Consolidated Program Information Report data provides the following estimates of children eligible and participating in Title II:

Number of Children	Public School Elementary	Public School Secondary	Non-Public School Elementary	Non-Public School Secondary
Eligible to Participate	21,135,956	13,754,929	2,164,454	647,962
Participating	19,567,226	12,672,066	1,926,956	539,565

The high participation rate in Title II by non-public school children is a feature of this program not common to most other Federal programs.

With respect to specific use of Title II money, the FY 1972 survey found that 65% of the funds were used to acquire library books, periodicals, etc.; 32% for audio-visual materials and 3% for textbooks. All data from CPIR represents only the Title II effort directly concerned with LEA's, as the collection method does not reflect activities conducted by the State office.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Collection of data on expenditures and pupil participation will be continued via the Consolidated Program Information Report. No formal evaluation of Title II is ongoing nor planned for the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. USOE Program Statistics compiled by the US Office of Education

2. The ESEA Title II Evaluative Survey: A Preliminary Report. Washington, D.C. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, November 1970.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Undergraduate Instructional Equipment

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VI-A	FY 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$35,000,000	$15,000,000
	1967	50,000,000	14,500,000
	1968	60,000,000	14,500,000
	1969	13,000,000	14,500,000
	1970	60,000,000	-0-
	1971	60,000,000	7,000,000
	1972	60,000,000	12,500,000
	1973	60,000,000	

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction in institutions of higher education by providing financial assistance on a matching basis for the acquisition of instructional equipment, materials and related minor remodeling. Funds are allocated to the States by a formula based on higher education enrollment and per capita income. State commissions rank applications submitted by the institutions and recommend the Federal share which, except in hardship cases, may not exceed 50 percent of the total project cost. Eligibility under the program has recently been extended to post-secondary vocational schools and community colleges.

Program statistics reflect this program redirection. Over one third of the 1107 grants awarded in 1972 were made to such post-secondary institutions: 222 grants totaling over $2 million were made for closed circut TV installations under this program.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program. No studies are planned for the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program operating data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Financial Assistance for Strengthening Instruction in Science, Mathematics, Modern Foreign Languages and Other Critical Subjects.

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
NDEA Title III (P.L. 85-864)	June 30, 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$ 100,000,000	$ 76,600,000
	1966	110,000,000	88,200,000
	1967	110,000,000	88,200,000
	1968	120,000,000	82,700,000
	1969	204,873,000	78,740,000
	1970	290,500,000	37,179,000
	1971	140,500,000	50,000,000
	1972	140,500,000	50,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Initially, Title III had two primary objectives: (1) To support the purchase of laboratory and other special equipment and materials as well as the cost of minor remodeling of facilities to accommodate equipment for elementary and secondary school instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages; and (2) To strengthen State leadership capacity for improving instruction in these three areas. The Federal Government contributed up to 50 percent of the costs of State education agency staff improvement and the costs of equipment, materials, and minor remodeling; State and local education agencies provided the remaining funds.

Through NDEA Title III support for equipment and minor remodeling, Congress intended the improvement of instruction to take place in a number of ways, including:

(1) Increasing enrollments in science, mathematics, and modern foreign language.

(2) Increasing the number of advanced courses in the three subjects.

(3) Increasing the number of laboratory sciences and modern foreign language.

(4) Changing the methods of teaching foreign language to improve skill in speaking.

(5) Emphasizing laboratory practice in teaching science.

Through Title III support, Congress encouraged States to hire additional specialists in the three subject areas so that State agencies would be able to provide leadership to local education agencies for:

(1) Developing up-to-date curricula.

(2) Planning appropriate course sequences for elementary grades through high school.

(3) Assisting in the selection of high-quality equipment and materials and enabling local education agencies to finance their purchase.

(4) Providing demonstrations of new equipment and materials.

(5) Conducting workshops and conferences to train teachers and other school personnel in new methodology, equipment, and materials.

(6) Preparing publications and other materials to keep teachers and other school staff informed of developments in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language.

Congress authorized the use of Title III to support SEA staff development because in 1958, the status of supervisory services was found to be inadequate, as noted in the Report of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

> Although adequate State leadership and supervisory service is widely recognized as vital to the development, maintenance, and improvement of sound classroom instruction, only two States have full-time supervisors in mathematics; six States have full-time supervisors in mathematics and science; and only two States have supervisors in foreign language instruction.

Soon after Title III was put into operation, educators and Members of Congress thought that other subjects in the curriculum needed similar attention. Reading and writing skills, for example, were not believed to be meeting acceptable standards. Similarly, Congress was concerned that students were insufficiently familiar with historical events, with the American form of government, and with characteristics of the earth. As a result, in 1964 Congress amended the NDEA and extended support -- under Title III (P.L. 88-665) -- to five additional subjects; history, civics, geography, English, and reading.

In 1965, as a part of the Higher Education Act (P.L. 89-329), Congress extended assistance to instruction in economics. A 10th subject, industrial arts, was added as a part of the Higher Education Amendments of 1966 (P.L. 89-752).

Under the Higher Education Amendment of 1968 (P.L. 90-575), Title III of NDEA was amended further. A new Part B now authorizes assistance for "the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having a high concentration of children from low-income families." However, no funds for Part B have ever been appropriated. By providing support for the seven additional subjects and by other changes, Congress has shown that its intent is broader than was indicated in NDEA as originally enacted.

This program also provides grants to the States for the cost of administering this program, and loans to private nonprofit schools for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling.

Each State is alloted funds for administration of the program, including salaries and expenses of State Title III staff, on the basis of the State's proportion of the schoolage population in the Nation, with a stipulation that each State receive at least $50,000. A separate formula is used to determine State allotments for distribution to local education agencies in support of approved projects -- involving equipment, materials, and minor remodeling. In this second formula the allocation is inversely proportional to per capita personal income in the State.

Except for a small portion retained for use in State-supported schools, most of a State's Title III allotment for equipment, materials, and minor remodeling is distributed by the State education agency to local education, agencies for specific projects. Each State determines local education agency eligibility and establishes State funding priorities. Although the Federal funds cannot exceed 50 percent of the cost of a project, the matching half of the cost may be provided by the State or the local education agency. Each State sets criteria for the State-local matching pattern. Almost all of the matching funds are providing by local education agencies.

Funds made available in FY 1970 and 71 were overmatched by State and local educational agencies by a 52 to 48 ratio. Almost $200,000,000 were spent for projects at the local level in FY 70 and 71. Approximately $87,000,000 came from the Federal government with the balance coming from State and local governments.

Federal expenditures under NDEA III amounted to $34.6 million for FY 70. These funds are focused on the general elementary and secondary population (81.5) percent) and children from low income area (6.5 percent).

Federal expenditures by subject areas, for the most part, are concentrated on natural science (32 percent), English (26 percent), and social science/social studies (16 percent).

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. USOE, NDEA Title III, Fiscal Year 1959-67, A Management View, May, 1969.
2. Strengthening Instruction in Science, Mathematics, Foreign Languages, and the Humanities and Arts, a chapter appearing in the The Federal-State Partnership for Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, May, 1970.
3. USOE, Program Statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education.
4. USOE, Strengthening Instruction In Academic Subjects.

G. Educational Technology Programs

1. Educational Broadcasting Facilities
2. Sesame Street and Electric Company
3. Media Specialist Program
4. Special Technology Demonstrations

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Broadcasting Facilities

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Communications Act of 1934, as amended Title III, Part IV	FY 1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 32,000,000	$ 13,000,000
1966	32,000,000	8,826,000
1967	32,000,000	3,304,000
1968	10,500,000	-0-
1969	12,500,000	4,000,000
1970	15,000,000	4,321,000
1971	15,000,000	11,000,000
1972	15,000,000	13,000,000
1973	25,000,000	13,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Matching funds are provided for the purchase of transmission apparatus necessary for initial activation or expansion of noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities to serve educational, cultural, and informational needs in homes and schools. Up to 75 percent matching grants are made to eligible tax supported institutions (such as school districts, colleges and universities); State Educational Broadcasting Agencies; nonprofit foundations organized primarily to operate an educational broadcasting station; and municipalities which own or operate a facility used only for noncommercial educational broadcasting. No State may receive more than 8-1/2 percent of the appropriation in any one year.

The major goal of this program is to stimulate the development of the broadcast facilities necessary for a national system of noncommercial educational and public broadcasting stations capable technically and programmatically of serving local, State, and national needs; and to make available to all citizens a quality noncommercial broadcast service comparable to commercial stations. At present, approximately 25% of the population is still without a useable noncommercial television signal. Similar objectives remain with respect to public radio service, where, for example, 40 of the 100 major markets have no noncommercial educational radio station, and substantial rural audiences remain under-served.

Program Effectiveness

Total noncommercial public television stations have increased from 76 in 1963 to 228 at the end of FY 1972, while an increase of approximately 50% in the number of qualified public radio stations has been made possible by program grants. Program results have made possible the establishment of the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) and the real-time transmission to all parts of the country of such ETV programs as well as cultural and informational programs for adult audiences. Instructional programming into schools (ITV) has increased to the extent that 53% of the nations schools and 57% of elementary and secondary students use educational telecasts.

Notwithstanding achievements to date, many of the original objectives of the Act and many established needs remain unfilled. From 125 to 150 new TV stations are required to provide services to population segments entirely unserved at present, as well as about 150 new radio stations. Approximately one-quarter of the TV stations and one-half of the radio stations now on the air have power too low to reach all of their community effectively. Among television stations, about one-third do not provide state-of-the-art color videotape of film capability, and one-half cannot originate programs with color camera apparatus.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The U.S.O.E. Evaluation Plan for FY 1973 includes a proposed "Educational Telecommunications Study." The Request-For-Proposals which is being developed concerns broadcast facilities needs in relation to the development of other communications technologies such as cable networks and instructional television fixed service.

Sources of Evaluation Studies:

Program Operating Data
Surveys of existing facilities made by the
  USOE National Center for Educational Statistics

Corporation for Public Broadcasting surveys
National Association for Educational Broadcasting
  studies

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Sesame Street and the Electric Company (Children's Television Workshop)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Cooperative Research Act (P.L. 83-531) as amended	FY 1975

Funding History:	Year	Coop Research Authorization	Appropriation
	1971	Indefinite	$ 2,000,000
	1972	"	7,000,000
	1973	"	6,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Children's Television Workshop is an independent, nonprofit organization. It is supported by grants and contributions from Federal and private sources, with the U.S. Office of Education as the main Federal contributor. CTW created and produced Sesame Street, which is now its fourth year of operation, and the Electric Company, which is in its second year.

Sesame Street is an Educational Television program targeted at preschool, disadvantaged children. It aims to develop the child's understanding of symbolic representation, his cognitive processes, his reasoning and problem solving ability, and his understanding of his world. The curriculum runs five hours per week for 26 weeks. Each year it is revised on the basis of evaluative research providing information about both audience penetration and educational effectiveness.

The Electric Company is a second series which has as its principal objective helping to teach basic reading skills to seven-to-ten-year olds with the major focus on poor readers in second grade. The series is designed to appeal to a nationwide, in-home audience and to students in classrooms. Primary emphasis has been in reaching children while they are in school, where teachers can facilitate and reinforce the objectives of the series, employing it as a supplement to their reading instruction.

These two television series are estimated to have reached approximately 13 million children last year. About 9 million viewed Sesame Street at a cost of less than $1 per viewer per year, and about 4 million saw The Electric Company at approximately $1.88 per student per year.

Program Effectiveness:

The Children's Television Workshop has been the focus of a recently recently completed study to find out how and why it works as an organization. CTW is not an educational project with entertainment trappings. Rather, it is more accurately described as a commercial-style, "big-time" television program seeking to accomplish educational ends.

Sesame Street has been under continuing evaluation since its first year. The overall conclusion is that the potential of Educational Television as an effective medium for teaching certain skills to very young children has been demonstrated by this series. An evaluation of the cognitive effects by the Educational Testing Service of the first year and of the second year also found that the program was successful in teaching basic facts and skills to 3, 4, and 5 year-old viewers.

The initial research and planning for the Electric Company was completed in 1970 and the program went on the air in October 1971. The Educational Testing Service is currently analyzing data collected during an evaluative study of that first year of operation.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Both Sesame Street and the Electric Company are subject to a continuous process of formative evaluation. As mentioned, evaluations are focused on two aspects, audience penetration and educational effectiveness.

Discussions are currently in process between OE and CTW concerning additional evaluative activities to be undertaken later this year. A choice will be made from among eight activities which include such items as: (1) The benefits to be considered in a cost-benefit analysis of the two programs, (2) Actual and potential uses of the Electric Company in adult literacy training, or (3) The effectiveness of the Sesame Street home resources project.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. The First Year of Sesame Street: An Evaluation, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, October 1970.

2. The Second Year of Sesame Street: A Continuing Evaluation, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, October 1971.

3. Who Watched the Electric Company, The Electric Company in-School Utilization Study: The 1971-72 School and Teacher Survey, Center for the Study of Education, Institute for Social Education, Florida State University, 1972.

4. The Children's Television Workshop: How and Why It Works, Nassau Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Jericho, New York, 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Media Specialist Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
EPDA, Part D, as amended	1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	Indefinite	$ 2,000,000
	1971	"	2,250,000
	1972	"	1,800,000
	1973	"	

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants to institutions of higher education, State departments of education, and local education agencies for the support of training for teachers, administrators, policy makers, and other staff specialists in the utilization of media and educational technology for the improvement of learning in elementary, secondary, and post-secondary vocational schools.

There are two major categories of operations -- the Regular Program and the Instructional Development Agency Program. Under the regular program in FY '72, 13 awards were made to institutions in support of long- and short-term training for media specialists and educational technologists, and another award was made to the University of Maryland in support of a Leadership Training Institute. Its goal is the development, in collaboration with the directors of the projects mentioned above, of policy and procedural recommendations for educational technology training.

Under the Instructional Development Agency program, awards were made for the introduction of this type of training in 28 States. An Instructional Development Agency (IDA) trains its participants to use a validated procedure for the application of a systems approach to the solution of critical teaching and learning problems. A "multiplier effect" is realized as each IDA, in turn, conducts at least three more similar training sessions, or Instructional Development Institutes (IDI), at the local educational agency level. Awards made in FY '72 provide for 169 IDA/IDIs with approximately 8,600 participants.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been made.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Statistics
Field Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Technology Demonstrations

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Cooperative Research Act (P.L. 83-531) as amended.	1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1972	Indefinite*	$ 3,000,000
	1973	"	10,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The National Center for Educational Technology is responsible for coordinating the Office strategy for investments in and applications of technology to education. One of its major responsibilities is to demonstrate alternative instructional systems for students at all levels of education and to explore the viability and feasibility of various mixes of technology-based systems for the purpose of improving educational productivity and efficiency. The demonstrations are designed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of existing State and local educational systems and to extend the access to education and related services of audiences and learners both within and outside the regular educational systems. By fostering practical demonstrations of technology-based education and installation of telecommunication equipment, the program will enable larger numbers of Americans to receive information, public services, and educational experiences at costs less than those required by the traditional systems and approaches.

During FY 72 the program explored a number of possibilities in order to determine where major demonstrations might be feasible. For this purpose planning studies were supported in a number of areas such as: (1) Use of a satellite to provide educational services to remote areas in the Rocky Mountain States, Alaska, and Appalachia; (2) Education of the parents of disadvantaged children through techniques developed in the production of the TV show Misterogers Neighborhood; (3) Development of an "open university" through television at the State University of Nebraska; (4) A study of the issues in educational technology conducted by the National Academy of Engineering Sciences; and (5) The development of a bilingual childrens' television program somewhat similar to Sesame Street.

---

*The funds for this Program are only a part of those appropriated under the Cooperative Research Act.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Satellite project being conducted by the Federation of Rocky Mountain States is accompanied by an evaluation project. The evaluation staff works on a daily basis with the Federation staff to insure that the planning for the major Satellite Demonstration can be thoroughly evaluated.

The Bilingual Childrens' Television project is receiving support for developing an evaluation design.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Project reports on planning and/or exploratory activities.

H. Special Demonstration Programs

1. Right-to-Read
2. Drug Abuse Education
3. Environmental Education
4. Nutrition and Health
5. Dropout Prevention

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Right-to-Read

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Varied[1]	None

Funding History:		**Year**	**Authorization**	**Appropriation**
	FY	1971	Indefinite	$ 2,000,000
		1972	Indefinite	12,000,000
		1973	Indefinite	12,000,000[2]

Program Purpose and Operation:

The long-range goal of the Right-to-Read Program is to increase substantially functional literacy in this country. The ability to read is essential for one to function effectively as an adult in our society, Yet, more than three million adults in the United States are illiterate and approximately 18½ million cannot read well enough to complete simple tasks required for common living needs. Approximately 7 million public school children require special instruction in reading. Even after they have completed high school, one-third to one-half of the new students in junior colleges need some type of reading help.

Through the demonstration of effective and efficient reading programs and the provision of technical assistance, the objective of Right-to-Read is to help all reading programs to become effective, regardless of the source of funding, the level of instruction or the age of the participant. This program hopes to influence Federal formula grant and discretionary funds as well as State and local funds, and will involve experimental, demonstration, service and support activities. It will also be responsible for awarding a limited number of grants and contracts.

---

[1] FY 72 Projects were funded from the following sources:

1. Title III, ESEA, 1965, as amended
2. Title VII, ESEA, 1965
3. Adult Basic Education Act, 1966
4. Title IV, Higher Education Act, 1965
5. Education Professions Development Act, Part E
6. Education Professions Development Act, Part D
7. General Education Provisions Act, Sec. 402
8. General Education Provisions Act, Sec. 412

[2] Proposed budget to be funded under the Cooperative Research Act.

Following an initial year of program planning and organizational development in FY 71, the Right-to-Read Program provided support in various ways for State and local participants during FY 72. By the end of the year, 244 school-and-community-based projects had been funded. The school-based projects serving approximately 80,000 students focused on improving the reading skills of school-aged children in kindergarten through grade twelve enrolled in local schools. The projects were classified into four major types:

> "Transition site": one which was without substantial Federal funds earmarked for reading improvement but which was willing to make the transition from existing ineffective reading programs to effective ones; "redirection site": a site that did have substantial Federal funds for reading improvement but still needed to make the change from ineffective to effective methods; "expansion site": one with promising practices related to the teaching of reading, with students who were achieving in the second and third quartiles (instead of the lowest quartile as did the students in the transition and redirection sites); and "Impact site" a program was exemplary and could be replicated in two or more satellite schools.
>
> Thirty-three of the projects were bilingual.

The 74 community based programs were directed toward the out-of-school adolescent population, the young adult and the older adult in need of reading help. Community based programs were much more diverse in type of location, population, and program intent, and could be found, for example, in prisons, community colleges, the inner city, and on reservations. The projects serve an estimated 7,400 out-of-school clients.

Additional support activities were funded and undertaken during the year. For example, eleven State education agencies were funded and agreed to utilize Right-to-Read as a coordinating vehicle for all Federal and State programs with reading activities.

In addition, funds for technical assistance were awarded to 5 institutions which provided, through educational planners and reading consultants, assistance to the projects in assessing needs, planning and implementing the reading program as well as assisting in internal evaluation

Finally, the Right-to-Read program developed and made available to every grantee systematic planning materials and effective reading programs presented in a packaged form. These materials included the process for planning and implementing a reading program as well as descriptive information.

Because the directly-funded school-and community-based projects were funded mid to late in the FY 72 funding year and had to engage in a necessary pre-operational analysis and planning process, no projects completed a project cycle that would allow an assessment of outcomes and results in terms of reading achievement gains during the reporting period. A system of project assessment for the school-based sites was developed and is currently in operation and will provide data on project effectiveness during FY 73 (see section below). A similar evaluation of community-based projects is currently in the planning stage.

In the meantime a number of Office of Education activities underway are providing useful data and information necessary for continued strengthening and refinement of planning and management of the Right-to-Read program.

One such example of related support activities is the National Assessment of Education Progress program funded by the Office of Education. The first report on the status of reading was released in May 1972. This report establishes a national baseline. Right-to-Read will work closely with National assessment in order to design forms for collecting and reporting the progress made toward the elimination of illiteracy. These reports shall be released to the public periodically and serve as a yardstick or goal measurement. For the first time, a national thrust will be measured in terms of the impact of public and private sector programs on a major educational problem.

Other additions to the data base include a literature search which determined the extent and distribution of the national reading problem by identifying, analyzing and summarizing existing survey and test data, determining the frequency of use for various instructional methods, approaches and materials, and describing the nature and extent of current practices in the training of those who teach reading.

A major conclusion of the review was that a better definition of literacy is needed to replace the variety of definitions now in place. The study also recommended that further efforts be directed to the economic consequences of reading, particularly in the adult population; for example, much more needs to be known about the reading requirements of jobs, especially those jobs which could be filled by the currently unemployed and underemployed.

Progress toward a new standard of literacy is being aided by the Texas State Education Agency, which is developing adult performance-level criteria to replace the "years of schooling" yardstick commonly used in determining literacy. With a grant from USOE, this project will also assist in the production of appropriate curriculum materials to aid the national Right-to-Read effort. The Educational Testing Service is preparing "minimal tasks" which adults are expected to perform and materials which can be constructed as an instrument to measure functional literacy. Results from these various studies will provide valuable management material for the Right-to-Read program.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation:

There are two major evaluation activities ongoing in the Right-to-Read program.

One project is developing procedures for continuous retrieval of information from Right-to-Read school based programs. This system will provide the Office of Education staff with descriptive data on program operation and ongoing effectiveness as well as providing through pre and post-tests information in terms of student achievement. This project will additionally provide information on correlation of achievement with attitude, pupil-teacher relationship, parental involvement and staff development.

Planning for a pilot evaluation of the community-based projects of the Right-to-Read program is presently underway. The evaluation contract is to be let in FY 73 with the pre-testing of students to be done in the Fall of 1973 and the post-testing in the Spring of 1974. The purpose of the evaluation is to discern the reading gains of the students in the various type projects. This, in turn, will allow the program administrators to make some judgements as to what types of projects are more effective and efficient in working with different kinds of students in different settings.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. National Achievement Study; periodic testing of reading achievement.

2. The Information Base for Reading; 1971.

3. Adult Level Performance Project; begun September 1971.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Drug Abuse Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970	FY 1973

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1971	$10,000,000	$ 5,610,000
	1972	20,000,000	12,400,000
	1973	28,000,000	12,400,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Program is to help schools and communities assess and respond to their drug problems by becoming aware of the nature of the problem and developing strategies aimed at its causes rather than merely its symptoms. The program strongly encourages a coordinated community effort.

Funds for training are allocated in project grants to State Education Departments, a network of regional training centers, and pilot projects in colleges and in various communities. Technical assistance for programs at each level is provided through the National Committee for Drug Education.

During the past year there were 55 state coordination projects which impacted on an estimated 173,000 people through education and training, 2,900 through direct services, and 287,000 through indirect services. One National and 7 regional training centers handled approximately 800 community leadership teams of 5 to 8 persons each. Fiscal Year 1972-funded activities also supported 20 college-based projects which impacted on approximately 1,200 students through education and training activities, 110,000 through direct services such as hot-lines and drop-in centers, and 29,000 through indirect services such as pamphlets or mass media. During that same period, 40 community projects reached about 10,000 people through education and training, 17,300 through direct services, and 3,850,000 through indirect services.

Program Effectiveness:

A number of investigations and evaluations of the program have taken place in earlier years. For example, a study of the initial National

Drug Education Training Program was conducted during 1970-71 to document and assess the impact of this program. The evidence suggested that OE goals were adequately fulfilled. The study documented the feasibility of a cooperative partnership between state and community agencies; the viability of institutions of public education as a vehicle for organizing, planning and executing training and prevention programs; and the ability of local agencies to capture millions of dollars worth of monitary and in-kind contributions. Information collected on the various state program operations was complemented by measurement of the impact of training on a sample of trainees and development of case histories of seven state programs.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

At the present time the National Drug Education Program is developing and implementing an operationally-based information support system for NDEP. This system will provide baseline information on objectives and activities of local projects, will identify discrepancies, and will report resultant changes in objectives or activities. Data will be aggregated to meet the needs of each decision-making level. Success will be measured in terms of meeting objectives or the process of reacting, reorganizing, and growth toward meeting objectives. The system is now operational but will undergo further refinement and documentation.

The Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention has issued a contract for a series of studies of drug abuse education and training programs administered by NIMH and OE. These studies will look at the effects of a sample of OE Regional Training Centers, Mini-Grant Communities and College and Community-Based projects in terms of their stated targets and intents.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Training for "People" Problems: An assessment of Federal Program Management Strategies for Training Teachers to Deal with Drug Education, 1971.
2. Drug Abuse Program Report: Program Evaluation by Summer Interns; 1971
3. National Study of Drug Abuse Education Programs; 1972
4. Field Study of Drug Use and the Youth Culture, 1972.
5. An Operationally-Based Information Support System for NDEP; in process.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Environmental Education

Legislation: | **Expiration Date:**

Environmental Education Act of 1970 (PL 91-516) | 1973

Funding History:

	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
FY	1971	$ 5,000,000	$ 2,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	3,514,000
	1973	25,000,000	3,180,000 (est.)

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of environmental education is to help individuals perceive environments in their totalities, develop an understanding of environmental phenomena and problems, and to identify and support educational activities which can enhance environmental quality. The Environmental Education Act is intended to encourage and support the development of both nonformal and formal educational resources required to achieve these objectives among all age groups and sectors of the country.

The Act is unique among Office of Education authorizations in that it provides (1) broad authority for flexible, responsive support of environmental education development needs (rather than support of predesignated activities), (2) support for community group sponsored nonformal education projects, and (3) environmental training for persons in various fields other than education, including those in business, industry and government whose activities may effect environment policies and activities, and hence quality.

The overall strategy of the Office of Environmental Education is to facilitate through technical assistance and grant funds (Environmental Education Act and other OE program authorities) the development of environmental education -- environmental studies programs and educational resources devoted to educating and informing our citizens about environmental quality and ecological balance. This strategy involves (1) development of content and process through pilot projects, (2) the dissemination and transfer of effective materials and approaches through local and national demonstration projects, and (3) through funds other than the Environmental Education Act, support of operational programs.

In FY 72, grant funds amounting to about $3 million were used to support a total of 162 environmental education projects for almost every age and grade level. These included curriculum material development, personnel training, and community education in urban, suburban and rural areas in every State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and Micronesia. By kinds of projects the breakdown is as follows:

a. dissemination centers -- 16;

b. personnel training -- 11;

c. community education -- 25

d. instruction and curriculum -- 66

e. workshops -- 33; and

f. State-wide evaluation and dissemination -- 11

It is estimated that up to 7,500 people have been provided direct training through these projects. In addition to Environmental Education Act funds, approximately $15 million from other OE programs supported environmental education-related activities; many of these were developed in response to the Environmental Education Act.

Another project involves the development of a management data base, the completion of a survey of resource for environmental education in all 50 States. Building upon State catalogs developed for the program, the survey includes comprehensive listings of programs, resource people, and relevant pieces of legislation. The Office of Environmental Education has also developed a descriptive listing of all USOE funded environmental education programs throughout the country, and a similar listing of all programs supported by other Federal agencies.

Technical or non-monetary assistance activities have included (1) assisting OE, regional and headquarter, program administrators in developing resources and expertise, (2) establishing local and regional planning and information networks, and (3) assisting other Federal agencies interested in educational programs relating to environmental quality.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations

None at this time.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

- -- ERIC/USOE Project Survey Reports/Documents
- -- OE funded Project Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Health and Nutrition

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 808	1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1971	$ 10,000,000	$ 2,000,000
1972	16,000,000	2,000,000
1973	26,000,000	2,000,000 (estimate)

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the program is to demonstrate ways through which the gap between needs and delivery of nutrition and health services can be narrowed by coordinating, focusing, and utilizing existing health, health related and educational resources at the local level, especially Federally funded programs. Federal program involved are HEW Children and Youth Projects, HEW Comprehensive Health Centers, NIMH Community Mental Health Centers, as well as OEO, Model Cities and Indian Health Service programs.

In FY 71, the first eight demonstration projects were funded, reaching 10,600 children in 26 schools. In FY 72 these projects were continued and four new ones were added, bringing the number of children served up to more than 15,000 in 45 schools.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Provisions for an individual evaluation are included in each project, and plans are being made by the project staffs for the collection of appropriate data. However, these evaluations will not be available until the projects are completed.

The U.S.O.E. Evaluation Plan for FY 1973 includes a proposed "Evaluation of Health and Nutrition Demonstration Projects." The design now being developed for this study would provide for examination of such variables as patterns of interagency coordination, service delivery systems, type and scope of resources available, and so forth. This evaluation design would be applied to the first eight projects toward the end of their second year of operation (May 1973) and would also be used in more limited form on the next four programs toward the end of their first year of operation (June 1973).

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Interim and annual progress reports are available from the eight projects which have already completed their first year of operation, and similar materials will become available on the newer projects during the year.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAM

Program Name:

Dropout Prevention

Legislation:

Title VIII ESEA, Section 807

Expiration Date:

FY 1973

Funding History:	Year (FY)	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$30,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	1970	30,000,000	5,000,000
	1971	30,000,000	10,000,000
	1972	31,500,000	10,000,000
	1973	33,000,000	10,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

For the 1969-1971 period grants were awarded to ten school systems submitting the most imaginative proposals for reducing the number of secondary education students leaving school before graduating. For FY 1972 an additional nine grants were awarded. Each of the funded projects must demonstrate ways for reducing the dropout rates in their school systems as well as providing insights for possible replication of their projects in other school systems. For FY 1973 nineteen will be continued at an estimated figure of 8.5 million dollars.

Results from the nineteen projects are available and discussed herein. These diverse projects are: Dropout Prevention through Performance contracting in Texarkana, Arkansas; Dade County Talent Development Program in Dade County, Florida; Focus on Dropouts ... A New Design in Paducah and Louisville, Kentucky; Keep All Pupils in School (DAPS) in Baltimore, Maryland; Project Process for Student Success in Fall River, Massachusetts; Project Stay in St. Louis, Missouri; Potential Dropout Recognition and Prevention Program in Fredonia, New York; Project Emerge in Dayton, Ohio; Parental Attitude and Student Retention Program in Batesland, South Dakota; Central Area Dropout Reduction Experiment (CADRE) in Seattle, Washington; Project Outreach in Ft. Logan, Colorado; A Project to Attract, Satisfy and Certify All Learners (PASCAL) in Riverton, Wyoming; Edison Project in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Project Build in Trenton, New Jersey; Project MAS in Hartford, Connecticut; Project Mack in Oakland, California; Project ARISE in Tuskegee, Alabama; Project NALAC in Detroit, Michigan and Student Support Program in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Some 69,227 students were involved in these projects.

4

Counseling services, staff training and curriculum or instructional revision were common activities to all projects. Fifteen projects conducted work-study or other vocational course; four offered special services for pregnant students; and five placed major emphasis on parental involvement. One project provided a "Personal Development Center" in an off-school facility for holding informal sessions for students who were unable to relate to conventional instruction.

In each funded project independent audits of evaluation and management designs were required for the purpose of determining the nature of management and program practices of project personnel. Auditors' interim and final reports, evaluation reports from each project, and the USOE personnel participation provide the basis for gaining insights into the operation and progress of each project.

Program Effectiveness:

Information about the Dropout Prevention Program comes from two main sources: (1) the Consolidated Program Information Report which provides data primarily upon expenditures and program participation and (2) evaluation reports and individual audits on each local project. The evidence from these reports indicates that the Dropout Prevention Program is well-focused upon its target population and that most projects have been effective in reducing the dropout rate.

Data provided from projects did indicate that the dropout rate has been reduced in the target schools. In the ten original target schools 3,572 dropouts were reported during the 1968-69 school year as compared to 1,953 reported in the 1971-72 school year. This indicates a 45% reduction in the number of dropouts during the three years of program operation. The nine new projects reported 2,600 dropouts in 1970-71 as compared to 1,843 dropouts in 1971-72, a 29% reduction in one year of operation. Individual projects reported that dropout rates decreased during the past year. In Seattle and Fort Logan rates decreased from 18.1% to 12% and 11% to 7% respectively. Reductions were also reported in Baltimore, Riverton, Dayton, Miami, Chautauqua, Paducah, Texarkana, Philadelphia, Detroit, Minneapolis and Tuskegee. St. Louis reported an increase in the number of dropouts during 1971-72 as compared to the number during 1970-71 but the number during 1971-72 is 30% less than reported in 1968-69. The goal of the Dropout Prevention Program was to develop programs in target schools which would result in a 15% annual reduction in the number of dropouts or over a 5 year period, reduce the number of dropouts in the target schools by 50%. After three years of operation all but three projects are attaining this goal.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of the nineteen funded projects for FY 72 will be completed before the end of December 1972. An overall program evaluation is planned and will be completed in the fall of 1973.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. FY 1972 reviews of the evaluation and audit reports from the nineteen dropout prevention program. -- OE
2. Consolidated Program Information Report -- OE
3. Final Evaluation Report, Project KAPS, August, 1972
4. Final Evaluation Report, Project Outreach, August, 1972

I. Educational Research and Development Programs*

1. Basic Research Program, Including Regional Research
2. Applied Research and Development Program
3. Educational Laboratory and R&D Center Program
4. Research Training Program
5. Experimental Schools Program

---

*Transferred to NIE effective FY 1973

Program Effectiveness:

No formal evaluation of the Basic Research Program has been undertaken. The results of specific projects, however, suggest the use of the program.

One example was the 5-year updating of the Project Talent data bank which provides longitudinal information on about 400,000 persons who were high school students in 1960. From this data bank researchers are able to investigate relationships between educational achievement and aptitude, extra-curricula activities and vocational interests, socio-economic background, school characteristics, and subsequent activities and Vocational interests, socio-economic background, school characteristics, and subsequent activities of students. Other significant projects dealt with background differences of youth in high school, at work, and unemployed: factors influencing career decision-making; and a national survey of American Indian education. The Regional Research projects included some dealing with problems such as computer-assisted instruction for Spanish speaking teachers in mathematics, school readiness among disadvantaged children, and the year-round school program.

During the past few years there have been several reviews of the Research Program. Although not formal evaluations, they resulted in major decisions concerning the research program. One was to support a multidisciplinary Basic Research Program to handle unsolicited proposals reflecting the concerns of researchers in selected fields of study which do not traditionally respond to educational research requirements. During Fiscal Year 1972, the fields of anthropology and economics were provided this special stimulation.

A separate review of the Regional Research Program was undertaken with the assistance of the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University. The review confirmed that one of this Program's favorable characteristics was that it was considered to be closer to its clients than other R&D support programs. The review also highlighted the fact that the availability of support through the Program for doctoral dissertations was a major factor in producing talented educational researchers.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation studies are currently underway or planned for the near future. This program has been transferred to the National Institute of Education.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Small-Project Grants of the Regional Research Program. Theresa F. Rogers, Lois W. Sanders, and Bernard Levenson. Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, November, 1970.

2. Untitled Draft Report of a Study of Education Research and Development marked "Administrative Confidential." Xeroxed document forwarded by Alice M. Rivlin, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHEW, to Joseph Froomkin, Assistant Commissioner for Program Planning and Evaluation, OE, on June 25, 1968.

    Prepared as response to letter from Director, Bureau of the Budget, to Secretary of HEW dated December 1, 1967 requesting review of the Department's activities in education research and development. Includes discussion of the decision-making process of the Bureau of Research, raises questions for further discussion, offers "substantive issues," etc.

3. Educational Research and Development in the U.S. Office of Education (Draft). (Frequently identified as the "Westheimer" Report or the PSAC Report). Task Group on Educational R&D of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

    Frank H. Westheimer, Chairman of the Task Group, Dept. of Chemistry, Harvard University; John M. Mays, Staff Member for the Task Group, Office of Science and Technology.

    President's Science Advisory Committee, Draft dated October 22, 1968. 37 pp. No cover.

    Summarizes the PSAC Task Group's understanding of the USOE Regional Laboratories, Research and Development Centers, and other projects -- especially basic research. Group visited four laboratories and five centers. Makes recommendations to improve operations of OE's R&D program.

4. Research Subcommittee Report--July 15, 1969. Michael O'Keefe Research Subcommittee Chairman Typed Memorandum to Assistant Secretary/Commissioner of Education James E. Allen from Michael O'Keefe, undated.

Memorandum contains key recommendations of the Research Subcommittee for consideration by the DHEW Education Task Force. Attached report discusses objectives, priorities, budget recommendations, and program descriptions.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Applied Research and Development Program

Legislation:

Public Law 531, 83rd Congress as amended by
Title IV, Public Law 89-10

Expiration Date:

Open

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	Indefinite	$ 18,283,000*
1966	"	30,500,000*
1967	"	23,485,000*
1968	"	24,865,000*
1969	"	24,397,000*
1970	"	22,562,000*
1971	"	3,041,000
1972	"	9,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Applied Research and Development Program is to: (1) produce through applied research conclusions for making major decisions about educational problems, and (2) produce tested alternatives to existing educational practice. Projects are directed toward such problems as resource allocation, accountability, and treatment of student alienation.

Program Effectiveness:

During the past few fiscal years, emphasis in applied research and development has moved from a relatively unstructured program based on unsolicited proposals to a more targeted or focused type of effort. The results of recent projects indicate the outcome of this program change. An example of providing relevant conclusions for educational decision-making (the first purpose noted above) is the process whereby a competency-based teacher training model developed under the Program has been used in a number of Teacher Corps projects to improve preparation of prospective teachers of the disadvantaged. The basic design of the models program has been included in the Teacher Corp guidelines and in other programs that provide support from the Education Professions Development Act.

---

*For the Fiscal Years 1965 through 1970 there was only a single line item to cover both Research and Development.

The second purpose, production of educational alternatives, is reflected in a variety of projects such as the following: (1) The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education designed and developed an information system and network facilities for better planning and management in colleges, universities, and higher education agencies; (2) The Florida State Junior High School Science Curriculum was developed and is now being used with 400,000 students; (3) The National Academy for School Executives which developed methods and materials for training more than 1,000 School Executives each year.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No new studies are planned in this area. This program has been transferred to the National Institute of Education.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of the Impact of Educational Research and Development Products. American Institutes for Research. Calvin Wright and Jack Crawford.
2. State-of-the-Art in Early Childhood Education: A Literature Survey. Central Midwestern Regional Education Laboratory. James Miller.
3. Selection of Products for Focused Dissemination. Educational Testing Service. Marion Epstein, Elizabeth Margosches, William Schrader, and Wesley Watton. June, 1971. 67 pp.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Laboratory and R&D Center Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Public Law 531, 83rd Congress, as amended by Title IV, Public Law 89-10	Open

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1964	Indefinite	$ 1,000,000
1965	"	2,520,000
1966	"	25,270,000
1967	"	29,600,000
1968	"	34,600,000
1969	"	34,210,000
1970	"	34,906,000
1971	"	33,406,000
1972	"	35,870,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Institutional Research and Development Programs of the Office of Education have the dual objective of building a network of educational research and development institutions capable of working on the solution of pressing educational problems and of supporting specific research and development efforts within these institutions. The Office of Education presently supports 23 laboratories and centers at an average cost of $1.3 million each per year. The laboratories are non-profit corporations which were established to develop tested alternatives to current school practice which meet the practical and immediate needs of schools and to respond to both regional and national problems in their program efforts. One of the laboratories also serves as headquarters for the National Program on Early Childhood Education comprised of a consortium of university research centers throughout the country. The R&D Centers were established within the formal structure of universities to conduct research and development activities on selected areas in education at various levels.

The research and development efforts underway in the Laboratories and Centers are designed to create alternatives in seven major areas: (a) theory and knowledge building for organizational change; (b) planning, management, and evaluation systems; (c) instructional personnel development; (d) curricular programs; (c) culturally targeted curricular programs; (f) home/school intervention in the early years; and (g) career education.

This program has been transferred to the National Institute of Education.

Program Effectiveness:

The results of selected projects indicate the uses of the Program.

Examples of accomplishments of the Educational Laboratories include: (a) The Mini-Course series, now commercially available to schools desiring to help teachers make improvements in basic teaching skills; (b) Communications Skills Program for teaching reading to kindergarten children, including disadvantaged groups, now reaching 80,000 children and to be used in '72 - '73 by 300,000 children. Lab products recently recommended for nation-wide dissemination include a parent/child toy lending library, a bilingual early-childhood program, and a multi-cultural social education program.

Equally important outcomes have resulted from the programs and projects of the Centers. (1) Individually Prescribed Instruction, a comprehensive curriculum system, new reaching well over 50,000 students in a nation-wide network of 250 elementary schools; (2) The multi-unit elementary school was an organizational system used in 8 States (164 schools) during 1970-71 and is now ready for wide-spread installation; (3) The Wisconsin design for reading skill development helped 22,000 children make 12- to 19-month gains in a 6-month test period; (4) The elementary school evaluation kit, along with instructional techniques to help administrators conduct effective, systematic evaluations of their schools, is now used by 180 districts across the country; (5) The Teaching of Science, a self-directed program to help individualize elementary science teaching, has been validated preservice training at 12 colleges and for inservice training with over 900 teachers.

The Labs and Centers have been evaluated annually in connection with refunding. Given static funding and increased costs,this has led to a reduction in the total number of institutions in recent years. On the basis of these evaluations, decisions about continuation funding have concentrated available support in the more promising programs and institutions and stressed completion of high-quality products and maintenace of institutional R&D momentum. Support was withdrawn from laboratories which seemed least likely to develop excellent products.

Two recently completed evaluation studies continue the effort to find ways to improve the internal management and evaluation of the Program. One completed project developed plans for evaluating the current operations of its R&D institutions. This is the basis for a new internal evaluation system which is being readied for installation and which will permit more effective monitoring of Labs and Centers.

A second completed exploratory study of cost factors involved in OE-supported educational research and development indicated that useful data on costs are difficult to obtain because of the differences among cost accounting systems in Labs and Centers. A model data collection system was prepared and a procedure for developing cost factors was offered. The project also led to the establishment of a new effort which will develop a set of guidelines for internal management so that more nearly comparable cost data may be obtained in the future.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two projects are currently underway.

The first is developing and will demonstrate a system for evaluating the R&D institutions in terms of the products they have turned out during the past three years. This system will also be sufficiently flexible to permit evaluations of the Lab and Center Program's success in producing materials for a given area, such as reading or arithmetic, and will permit comparisions across areas in order to identify where additional work is needed.

Secondly, a comprehensive evaluation of the Programs was begun in the spring of 1972 in anticipation of their transfer to the National Institute of Education, and will be completed by NIE following that transfer. The evaluation generally follows the design formulated under the Ohio State contract. The key features of this design are as follows: (1) use of programs within institutions as the unit to be evaluated; (2) classification of programs with similar purposes into groups; (3) establishment of Specialist Panels of experts for each group of programs; (4) evaluation and comparison of all the programs within each group by the associated specialist Panel; transmission of Specialist Panel evaluations to a Master Panel for cross group comparisons and funding recommendations to NIE. NIE took the results of these panels and has made decisions as to future support.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Development and Tryout of an Evaluation System for Ascertaining the Effectiveness of Educational Laboratories and R&D Centers. American Institutes for Research. James Dunn

2. Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions. Ohio State University Research Foundation. Diane L. Reinhard. August 31, 1971. 9 pp. plus two Advocate Team Reports.

3. Cost Factors for Educational Research and Development: An Exploratory Investigation. Resource Management Corporation. John Phillips and James Scott, September, 1971. 62 pp. (DRAFT)

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Research Training Program

Legislation:

Public Law 89-10, Title IV

Expiration Date:

FY 1972
(Transfer to NIE)

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	Indefinite	$ 7,400,000
	1967	"	6,500,000
	1968	"	6,750,000
	1969	"	6,750,000
	1970	"	6,350,000
	1971	"	3,250,000
	1972	"	3,250,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to strengthen the training of specialists who conduct educational research or who develop, evaluate, disseminate and install major improvements in educational practice. Such personnel work in local, State, and Federal education agencies, in higher education institutions, and in public and private research and development organizations.

Under this program, grants and contracts are awarded to improve the training of educational research and development personnel by: (1) Identifying critical personnel and training needs: (2) Developing and demonstrating effective recruitment and training techniques and instructional materials; and (3) Stimulating adoption of the improved training program.

The Research Training Program was changed substantially in 1971 as a result of studies and reviews described below. A new program strategy was implemented which stressed development and demonstration of training techniques and materials that can be adopted in many institutions wishing to improve their training capability. The new strategy was initiated through projects in three consortia composed of educational R&D organizations, universities, school systems, and State educational agencies and through complementary projects at non-consortium institutions. Specialized programs were demonstrated for: (1) Meeting inservice and preservice training needs of R&D personnel in member institutions of the consortia, (2) Recruiting and training minority personnel, (3) Orienting unemployed aerospace personnel to educational R&D, and (4) Training new types of paraprofessional and support personnel to relieve senior staff of less complex but time-consuming activities.

Graduate and post-doctoral programs supported since 1966 are being converted to self-support by the end of 1973. Support was continued during FY 1971 for 420 graduate trainees who entered programs in 1970, but no new fellowships were awarded. In FY 1972, final commitments were met to 100 remaining students who were in their final year of work.

Program Effectiveness:

During the last several years planning studies have acquired information about both manpower and content needs in research training. Also, a special task force was set up in 1970 to assess the direction of the program in its early years with respect to the results of the analytic studies. These studies indicated that (1) Fellowship support has attracted young people into educational research with academic qualifications equivalent to or exceeding students in the scholarly disciplines, (2) Specialized training programs need to be started for new roles in developing, installing, disseminating and evaluating improved educational practice, (3) Instructional materials for new roles in educational R&D need to be developed and validated, (4) Training needs to be organized so that more students can learn from direct experience on major R&D practitioners and instructors. A personnel supply and demand study has projected shortages of evaluators in the 1970's, especially in State and local educational agencies, that can be met at a reasonable cost only be expanding and improving inservice training and by upgrading foundation courses in evaluation institutions which already attract large numbers of highly able graduate students.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

This program has been transferred to the National Institute of Education.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Development of Procedures for Upgrading Training of Educational Research Personnel. American Educational Research Association., Blaine Worthen.

2. Study of Research and Research-Related Personnel in Education and Procedures for Facilitating and Improving the Training of such Personnel. American Educational Research Association. Blaine Worthen.

3. Generation of Information to Support Long-Term Manpower Studies of and Planning for Training Programs in Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Evaluation. Teaching Research, Oregon State System of Higher Education. H. Del Shalock.

4. Review of Research Related to Training for Research in Education. Robert Bargar & Corhann Okorodudu, authors, Ohio State University Research Foundation, Columbus, 1967. 211 pp. Paper-board cover.

   Reviews studies of research training in other fields as well as well as specific training in education. Variables such as student background, student selection, faculty recruitment, institutional setting are discussed.

5. A Study of Factors Relevant to the Development of Applied Educational Research Training Programs Bound dissertation.
   Bound dissertation.
   Bernard J. Fleury, Jr., author
   Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts, April, 1968. 231 pp. Spring-binder

   Evaluation of USOE (Title IV) training programs in general and U. of Mass. Training Program in particular. Data from questionnaires include: academic background, age, grade-point average of research trainees as well as course content, practicum experiences, and program requirements of training program. Includes recommendations and outline of model program for U. of Mass.

6. Report on Educational Research, Development, and Diffusion Manpower, 1964-1974
   David L. Clark & John E. Hopkins, authors
   Indiana University Research Foundation (Bloomington), 1969. 579 pp. Soft cover.

   Makes qualitative and quantitative analyses of personnel in educational R, D, & D in 1964: roles, institutional settings, training, funding, functions. Gives projections of demands for personnel in 1974 and analyses of current training programs and sources of supply. Discusses Title IV ESEA research training programs. Makes recommendations for increasing manpower supply.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Experimental Schools Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Public Law 89-10, Title IV*	Open

*Transferred to NIE

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1971	Indefinite	$ 12,000,000
	1972	"	15,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Experimental Schools Program is to test comprehensive alternatives to present educational practices, procedures, and performance. By supporting a limited number of large-scale, comprehensive experiments with a major focus on documentation and evaluation, Experimental Schools will attempt to serve as a bridge from research, demonstration and experimentation to actual educational practice.

During FY 1971 this program initiated three Experimental Schools projects (in Berkeley, California; Pierce County, Washington; and Minneapolis, Minnesota) which involve over 11,000 students, of whom 55 percent were from low-income families. The projects each represent the combination of a diversity of promising practices derived from research, demonstration, and experimentation in a comprehensive educational program. Among these practices are at least a dozen which have been developed under projects supported through the OE extra-mural R&D.

In FY '71 11 sites were awarded planning grants for the further development of projects designed to be comprehensive alternatives to current school structures, practices, and performance. Three projects became operational in FY '72: San Antonio, Texas; Greenville County, South Carolina, and Street Academies in South Bend, Indiana, Oakland, California, and Washington, D.C.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed. However, project evaluation and documentation will consume from 15 percent to 20 percent of the funds. Formal evaluation of the individual projects will not be completed until the end of the 5-year span of each project.

In FY '71 an evaluation and documentation study was started for each of the three projects which began operational. A separate, independent evaluation team is now operating at each site.

Similar evaluation studies will be initiated for each new Experimental Schools project. In addition, at least one study will cut across all projects to get at generalizations and compare outcomes.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The evaluation studies mentioned above and listed below are currently underway. Future studies will be commenced as part of each new project.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation and Documentation of Berkeley Unified School District Experimental Schools Project. Scientific Analysis Corp. Dorothy Miller.
2. Evaluation & Documentation of Franklin Pierce School District Experimental Schools Project. Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. Wayne Doyle.
3. Evaluation and Documentation of Minneapolis Public Schools, Southeast Alternatives Project, Minneaspolis Evaluation Team. Aries Corporation. Stephen Lundin.
4. Evaluation & Documentation of Greenville County (S.C.) Piedmont Experimental Schools Project. Ultra-systems, Corp. Fernando Oxaca.
5. Evaluation & Documentation of Edgewood (Texas) Experimental Schools Project, Development Associates, Inc. Robert Cervantes
6. Evaluation & Documentation of the Street Academy Projects, National Urban League, Barbara Jackson.
7. Evaluation & Documentation of the Small Schools in Rural Areas Project. Abt Associates, Inc. Robert Herriott.

J. Educational Dissemination Programs

*1. Spread of Exemplary Practices
*2. Strengthening State and Local Dissemination Capabilities
*3. Educational Resources Information Centers
*4. Interpretive Summaries
5. General Program Dissemination: Office of Public Affairs

*Transferred to NIE effective FY 1973

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Spread of Exemplary Practices

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Cooperative Research Act P.L. 83-531	None

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1971	Indefinite	$2,200,000
	1972	Indefinite	2,200,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of this program is to accelerate the spread and installation of validated practices and research-based products. This is a developmental/demonstration program directed at the needs of local school districts for information about, and support for, trying out and adopting successful innovations. The program provides project grants to identify and verify the effectiveness of research-based products and school-developed programs; to bring information about these programs to local educators and organizations that serve local educators; to operate visitation and observation services at sites of selected exemplary programs; to provide follow up consultation of schools interested in adopting programs; and to accelerate nationwide use of selected major R&D based instructional systems by arranging for their use in geographically scattered settings.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Three evaluation projects were begun in FY 1971 to track three initial efforts to spread successful programs. One project is following the impact of the effort designed to encourage use of alternative successful reading programs. Another is evaluating the impact of a traveling display which presents information about 10 major research-based instructional approaches and teaching methods. A third evaluates the success of the installation of the Multi-unit staffing and instructional model in 250 schools.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Investigation of Communication Efforts and their Relation to Stages of Adoption of Selected Reading Programs 7/1/71 - 12/31/72.

2. Evaluation of Communication Exposure and Subsequent Action with Respect to Educational Innovations in 10 Display Modules of Educational Products - 7/1/71 - 6/30/72.

3. Evaluation of the Nation-wide Installation of the Multi-unit School Projects - 8/1/71 - 8/31/72.

4. Output measures maintained by NCEC.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening State and Local Dissemination Capabilities.

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Cooperative Research Act P.L. 83-531, as amended	None

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	Indefinite	$ 400,000
	1971	"	650,000
	1972	"	650,000
	1973	"	433,341 (Obligated)

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of this program is to strengthen the capabilities of State and local education agencies to acquire, disseminate, and apply results of research and successful innovation programs. This is a developmental/demonstration program directed at the needs of local educators for information which may be used to solve educational problems. The program awards grants and contracts to State and local agencies for the planning and operation of educational resources centers. Staff from State and local centers help the educator specify his problem, aid him in locating available information from the entire Nation, and carry through by securing additional help, when necessary, for the application of the information.

The program began FY 1970 with awards for initial State Pilot Dissemination Programs in three States. An additional five State pilot centers added in FY 1971, along with five local sites.

Program Effectiveness:

A formative evaluation of the operation of the three Pilot State centers by Columbia University is completed. Evidence in the evaluation report supports the validity of combining an informal retrieval service at the State agency level with local field agents who provide interpersonal assistance. Information was utilized more effectively when channeled through an agent than when provided by itself. The three States, in their first two years provided over 5,000 information packages in reply to information requests from administrators, teachers, and State agency staff. Over 40% of the clients gave evidence of actual use of the information or assistance they received. The vast majority of clients intended to use the service again and had already recommended the service to others.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Data from the evaluation report is being utilized in the planning and operation of additional State centers. It has had a strong influence in the conceptualization of new dissemination linkage programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of Pilot State Dissemination Programs - 9/29/70 - 12/31/72.

2. Records maintained by the States.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Resources Information Centers

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Cooperative Research Act P.L. 83-531, as amended	None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	Indefinite	$1,200,000
1967	"	2,415,000
1968	"	2,400,000
1969	"	4,045,000
1970	"	5,200,000
1971	"	4,000,000
1972	"	4,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Educational Resources Information Centers (ERIC) is to provide ready access to research, development, and evaluation reports, descriptions of exemplary programs, and current journal literature. Through a network of specialized clearinghouses and for profit contractors, current significant reports relevant to education are acquired, evaluated, abstracted, indexed, and announced in ERIC reference journals. Full copies of desired documents are made available in micro-form (microfiche) or pamphlet form (hard copy). Contracts are awarded for the operation of all ERIC components. This is a service program which meets the needs of educators for current information in all fields of education.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of the operation and impact of this program has been undertaken in earlier years. Four formal studies have now commenced (see section on ongoing studies below). In the meantime, informal evaluation of ERIC has been conducted by OE staff as well as ERIC's customers continuously since its inception in 1966. There has been continuous growth in sales and use of ERIC products. A number of indicators such as sale of reports, number of organizations buying all ERIC microfiche, number of requests for help from clearinghouses, and reports from college and university libraries and State and local information centers, provide some data on the utility of these services and products.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In FY 1971 the Office of Education initiated four formal evaluation studies on critical aspects of the ERIC program: an evaluation of ERIC products and services; an assessment of the quality and utility of ERIC clearinghouse products plus other NCEC products; a study to define and categorize the user community, to analyze the present structure and composition of the ERIC files, and to offer cost-beneficial strategies for organizing the files for easier practitioner use.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation Study of ERIC Services and Products
   4/1/70 - 12/31/71.
2. An Evaluation of NCEC Information Analysis Products
   7/1/71 - 3/31/72.
3. An Analysis of the ERIC Systems
   6/30/71 - 11/30/71.
4. The ERIC File Partition Study
   6/29/71 - 6/29/72
5. Growth and Use Data compiled by NCEC

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Interpretive Summaries

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Cooperative Research Act P.L. 83-531, as amended	None

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1971	indefinite	$ 600,000
	1972	"	600,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of this program is to disseminate interpretive summaries of current knowledge for use by educators. This program is a service program directed at the needs of busy teachers, administrators and school board members for summaries of current knowledge. Project grants or contracts are awarded for the preparation of interpretations of knowledge on topics of national concern. The contractor is required not only to analyze and interpret reports of research and current practice, but also to include representatives of the intended users as advisors or as a test group to assure the relevance of his report to their needs. The resulting interpretive summaries have mainly been disseminated as monthly reports under the PREP series (Putting Research into Educational Practice). Other dissemination forms include reports written for teachers, administrators, or other specialists for audiovisual presentation and leadership training conference.

Program Effectiveness:

No overall evaluation of the general impact of this program on educational decision-making has been undertaken. Operational experience indicates, however, that there is an interested clientele for the program product. For instance, PREP reports have been well received by State dissemination centers. State agencies have reproduced and disseminated over 200,000 copies of PREP reports and ERIC clearinghouse publications with no additional support.

Formal studies to identify user needs, which are essential to program operation, have been undertaken. One such study, conducted in FY 1969, identified priority areas that were used as topics for some of the early interpretive summaries.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A study was begun to update the previous user needs study as well as to design instruments and procedures which may be used to collect similar information on a periodic basis (probably biannual). Also in FY 1971, a project was initiated to evaluate the quality of PREP reports and other ERIC publications.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Innovative Problems and Information Needs of Educational Practitioners 6/25/69 - 3/25/70.
2. Developing a Sensing Network for Information Needs in Education 6/25/71 - 6/24/72.
3. An Evaluation of NCEC Information Analysis Products 7/1/71 - 3/31/72.
4. Informal Survey of State Departments on Use of PREP.

AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

General Program Dissemination: Office of Public Affairs

Legislation:	Expiration Data:
General Education Provisions Act, Section 412	None

Funding History:	Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
	1970	Indefinite	$1,600,000
	1971	"	500,000
	1972	"	400,000
	1973		750,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of General Program Dissemination is to make information available to the widest possible audience -- including the general population as well as professional educators -- about programs deriving from Office of Education supported research and practices. The funds are expended primarily through contracts for performing public information functions by means of various mass media and through meetings, conferences, or workshops. The purpose of these activities is to foster awareness of OE programs and to encourage individuals to take an active role in improving education in their communities. General Program Dissemination activities have been underway since FY 1970. Examples of the types of projects funded are a travelling seminar on reading, radio and TV spots, a film on early childhood education and the lifetime Learning Survey. Available program statistics, indicate the public contact of some of the products coming out of FY 70 funded projects. For example, as of May 31, 1972, a film, "The Right to Read," was shown 500 times on television to 23,000,000 estimated viewers, at a time value of $82,645. Theatrical bookings for the same time period totaled 8,160 with 19,623 showings to 721,637 people. Radio and Television spot commercials will be distributed beginning in April 1973. Another film on early childhood education "The First Years Together... To Begin a Child" was distributed beginning in May 1972. As of June 30, 1972, 27 telecasts had been televised to approximately 2,236,700 viewers at a time value of $3,884. During the same time period the film was shown 392 times to an audience of 13,813.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal assessment of program effectiveness has yet been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Evaluation is built into each individual project as part of the management process. No separate formal evaluations have been performed or are contemplated.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Informal "inhouse" assessments

APPENDIX A

EXTRACT FROM FY 1971 ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT TO CONGRESS "A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OE PROGRAMS"

Appendix A

Extract from FY 1971 Evaluation Report to Congress
A General Overview of the Effectiveness of OE Programs

Recognizing that we do not yet have extensive evidence on the effectiveness of all Federal education programs, what can be said on the basis of limited data about how well these programs are achieving their principal objectives? As we attempt to answer this question, we should note by way of background that American education at all levels has traditionally been an almost totally local enterprise, with the funding for public schools coming largely from local taxes and the determination of educational policies and the administration of the schools being almost entirely under local authority. While the proportion of State financing of public schools has increased somewhat over recent years, the traditional role of the States has been mainly to enact and implement legal minimums for expenditures, teacher qualifications, curricular offerings, and student attendance. The Federal contribution in turn has been even smaller. The Office of Education presently contributes about 7%, and the Federal government as a whole about 12%, of the total national expenditures for education. It contributes 20% of the total for higher education. Taken all together the approximately 100 education programs and legislative titles which comprise this limited Federal role have been concerned with three basic objectives:

- To equalize educational opportunity among groups who are at a disadvantage educationally by reason of economic, racial, or physical and mental handicapping conditions.
- To improve the quality and relevance of American education, primarily through research, experimentation, demonstration, dissemination and training activities.

- To provide limited general support to selected educational functions and activities (such as libraries, developing post-secondary institutions, equipment and construction, etc.)

In this section, using available data and experience, we attempt to make a general assessment of how well these three major objectives are being furthered through the variety of programs which are devoted to them.

1. Equalizing Educational Opportunity

Few would disagree with the assertion that the need to equalize educational opportunity and to compensate for the educational deficits of the disadvantaged remains the major educational problem in American society. Approximately 65% of the current $5 billion OE budget is devoted to programs primarily concerned with this problem. The single largest program in this area is Title I of ESEA which is presently funded at the level of $1.6 billion annually.

The best assessment which can be made of Title I since its enactment in 1965 is that it is a mixture of very important achievements and unfulfilled promise. The mere passage of Title I legislation has put the Congress and the Federal government on record with a major commitment to redress the educational deficits which result from a childhood in poverty. It has sensitized State and local educational authorities to the importance of this problem and to the need to devote their funds and attention to its solution. The Title I funds themselves, after an early period of unproductively diffuse application -- and in some cases outright misuse -- are now better targeted on the neediest schools and pupils.

As for the effects which Title I funds and programs have had in improving educational achievement, the evidence is incomplete and less reassuring. We can only speculate as to what the effects would be on the current achievement levels of disadvantaged children if the Title I funds were removed, but while some states and localities report success, there is little solid evidence to indicate that the mere presence of these funds and programs has led to widespread and significant increases in achievement scores. Many economically disadvantaged children continue to arrive at school with a lower level of readiness and performance than their middle class peers, and to fall progressively further behind them through the elementary and secondary grades. The lack of evidence of dramatic achievement gains among disadvantaged children in most Title I programs is paralleled by similar disappointments with other compensatory education programs. We must simply acknowledge that the task of remediating the educational deficits of disadvantaged children is far more complex and stubborn than most had imagined; and it is clear that one of the major remaining tasks in educational R&D is to develop effective compensatory programs that can significantly redress these deficits.

Developing such model programs is one of the main purposes of the Follow Through program. Moreover, some progress along these lines is contained in a recently completed OE evaluation of individual compensatory program techniques and models funded from a variety of sources. This study examined 3,000 such programs and found 41 on which there was solid evidence of significant cognitive gains among disadvantaged children.

Another major area in which there has been a Federal effort to equalize educational opportunity is that of education of the handicapped. The sum total of the programs in this area is not large ($260 million in FY 72) and the strategy here -- again reflecting the concept of a limited Federal leadership role rather than an attempt to serve the entire target population -- has been to provide seed money and to support various demonstration efforts as a catalyst to increase State, local and private contributions toward a much needed expansion of handicapped programs. Our estimates are that at the present time only 40% of physically and mentally handicapped children are receiving minimally adequate educational programs. The evidence we have indicates that our handicapped strategy has been a largely successful one and has had a multiplier effect as noted by increased numbers of children served, the integration of new programs into the general pattern of special education services, and the introduction of innovative techniques to improve instruction. The Federal contributions seem to have been most visible in the research and teacher training areas. Federal support in these areas has helped develop a research cadre among special educators and to support development of teacher training programs in over 300 colleges and universities. However, the increased efforts that have been underway for some time to assist in the improvement in the quality of State and local services to the handicapped should soon be identifiable. Current ongoing evaluation activities should show whether or not Federal objectives are being achieved.

The need to equalize educational opportunity for members of racial minorities continues to be one of our greatest educational problems. With the exception of the Civil Rights Legislation, some set-asides for Indians and Migrants in ESEA Title I, the relatively small Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) which is intended to provide funds to assist schools carrying out desegregation plans, and the Bilingual education program, the Office of Education does not have major programs identified exclusively for Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, or other racial minorities. However, the overlap between those who are economically disadvantaged as well as members of racial minorities is so great that most of the programs aimed at the economically disadvantaged also serve directly large portions of racial minorities. Also, administration policy in areas such as the Developing Institutions program is to target a major portion of the available funds to Black colleges. The appropriations for the first two years of the ESAP program were not large ($75 million for FY 71 and the same amount for FY 72). However, the Emergency School Aid Act now before the Congress would provide $1.5 billion over a two year period. The initial demand for these funds throughout the South resulted in individually small grants, and the impact of these first small grants on the desegregation process appears to have been helpful but not dramatic. Evaluation findings on the program to date indicate that some of the ESAP activities showed positive effects. These activities include counseling, counseling support, student activities and remedial programs. Teacher training activities appeared to have little impact on teacher interaction with students of another race in the classroom.

In higher education a variety of programs have focused on equalizing access to higher education for the economically disadvantaged. For example, student loans and grants assisted two million students from low income families to attend colleges and universities in FY 71. It is estimated that one million of these students would have been unable to attend without Federal assistance. A trio of programs -- Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services -- have systematically sought out capable disadvantaged youngsters, provided encouragement and supportive services for them to attend college, and continued to provide additional support and assistance after they were admitted. The evidence indicates that the Upward Bound program in particular has been successful in getting talented children from low income families to complete high school, enter college, and remain there at rates significantly above what would have been the case without the program.[1]

The developing institutions program ($33.9 million in FY 71) is providing assistance to roughly 500 developing institutions in the U.S. in helping them strengthen their academic, administrative, and student services programs so that they can become financially self-sustaining and offer higher quality education to their students. Sixty percent of the funds are going to approximately 100 black institutions.

In sum, the largest thrust of the limited Federal role in American education has been the attempt to redress various inequalities of educational opportunity. None of these programs, individually or the

---

1. See the Upward Bound evaluation summary in Section III.

total group collectively, has yet succeeded in reaching all of their target populations, achieving all their objectives, or fully compensating for the educational deficits that result from being economically disadvantaged or physically or mentally handicapped. Nevertheless, the partial evidence we have in hand does seem to indicate that while new and effective program techniques need to be devised, coverage needs to be expanded, and management improvements are needed all along the line, these programs, taken as a whole, seem to have made a significant contribution to the goal of equalizing educational opportunity for all American citizens.

In addition to the traditional sources of unequal educational opportunity which Federal education programs have been addressing -- those deriving from economic, racial, physical and mental handicap conditions -- there has now emerged a new one which may well come to preoccupy as much of our concern and require as much fiscal and programmatic attention as these more traditional sources of inequality. This is the widespread inequity in educational finance. Recent court decisions in California, Minnesota, and Texas have all found that the basic system for financing elementary and secondary education which obtains in virtually all States and localities is unconstitutional because it discriminates on the basis of wealth by providing children who are born and grow up in a wealthy school district a better education than those who live in a poor district where limited resources result in much lower per pupil expenditures. If these court decisions are upheld for all States, massive reform of our present educational finance system will be required, and the traditional roles of local, State and Federal governments in the support of education will have to be completely re-evaluated.

2. Improving the Quality and Relevance of American Education

Improving the quality and relevance of American education is partly related to the goal of equalizing educational opportunity since better educational processes and techniques are required to improve the educational achievement of the disadvantaged. But the larger goal is to update and improve the educational system at all levels for all students. Approximately 15% of the OE budget is allocated to this goal. Most of this is in the form of project grants as contrasted to formula grant funds.

The research, experimentation, development, dissemination and training programs have provided the principal means for pursuing this goal. Although some notable successes were achieved by the educational research laboratories and centers and by project grants for basic and applied research (such as development of Individually Prescribed Instruction, the Multi-Level School, Computer Assisted Instruction, the Communication Skills Program, Sesame Street, the National Assessment Programs, new curricula in physics and English, and the Educational Resource Information Centers), there has been a general dissatisfaction with the impact of the R&D program. A number of reviews criticized the lack of significant breakthroughs, the diffuse and non-targeted nature of the project grant research, the non-productivity of some of the labs and centers, the inability to translate research into operational practice, and the difficulties in appraising and disseminating research findings and products. The substance of these criticisms has been acknowledged, but in fairness to the researchers, we should not lose sight of the fact that while the problems have been huge, the amount of funds allocated to educational research and development has been a shockingly small percentage of total national educational expenditures -- approximately one-tenth of one percent. It is only two percent of the OE budget.

The other principal programs which comprise OE's developmental and reform effort are reviewed briefly below:

> The Experimental Schools program ($15 million in FY 72), now finishing its second year of operation, tests comprehensive alternatives to present educational practices, procedures and performance in operational settings. It is too soon to assess its effectiveness, but a major evaluation is underway as an integral part of the program.
>
> Sesame Street is a highly successful educational TV program which imparts basic reading and arithmetic readiness skills to pre-school children. Evaluation study results show that approximately 8 million 3 to 6 year-olds have benefitted from this program, particularly children from low-income areas who have had access to television. The study indicated that 3, 4 and 5 year-old children from a variety of backgrounds acquired important complex as well as simple cognitive skills as a result of watching the program. Those who watched the most gained the most. This program is now being followed by the Electric Company, a remedial reading program for 7-10 year-olds using Sesame Street techniques.

Follow Through is a mixed experimental and service program developing and testing compensatory methods which can reinforce, from kindergarten through grade three, gains that disadvantaged children may have achieved in Headstart or similar preschool programs. Eighteen different models are being tested and the results from a major evaluation will be available by Fall, 1972. It is intended that successful Follow Through results will be used to influence ESEA, Title I.

The Bilingual Program is a demonstration program designed to meet the special education needs of children who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English. The program is aimed at the teaching of English while maintaining the home language and culture, and fostering legitimate pride in both languages. Quantitative evidence on the success of this program is not available but there is anecdotal evidence that suggests that the program may be effective in achieving competency in both English and the home language. A national evaluation of this program will be conducted in FY 72.

The Dropout Prevention Program is a demonstration program aimed at reducing the number of high school students leaving school before graduation. Evidence to date indicates that the program is well focused on its target population and that most of the ten projects funded were effective in reducing the dropout rate.

The Right to Read program is designed to substantially reduce functional illiteracy in the U.S. Through the demonstration of effective reading programs and the provision of technical assistance, the Right to Read program is aimed at helping locally operated reading programs to become effective regardless of the level of instruction or the age of the participant. The first sites were identified in January 1972 and thus, the program is too new to assess its impact.

The Dissemination program is undergoing a substantial expansion. In the past, the program provided mainly a library of educational materials of research and development products for use by researchers, practitioners and the interested public. This is the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) system. Although the ERIC system has grown steadily, the program is now being restructured to play a far more aggressive and active role with the goal of accelerating the adoption of innovative practices and products. The new program has several components. These include: State Dissemination Centers for general dissemination of information about tested and useful research products; Product Management Teams to assist school systems to adopt and install products; Education Extension Agents operating at the State and local level to assist educational decisionmakers to identify and adopt proven research products; and the Educational Renewal Sites which will provide a key mechanism for disseminating information to school personnel about promising innovations.

Teacher Training Programs - any reform strategy must involve improvements in the way that teachers are trained. Up until 1970 most of the effort of the teacher training institutions was aimed at reducing the teacher shortages that had existed for two decades. In 1970 the supply caught up with the demand and since then there has been a teacher surplus which is projected to continue until 1980. The surplus has enabled Federal, State and local agencies to focus on improving teacher selection and quality.

It is obvious that any real improvement in the educational systems must involve improvements in the preparation of teachers and in the quality of their teaching. This is not a new Federal goal. For example, the establishment of the Teacher Corps in 1965 was aimed at encouraging colleges and universities to modify and broaden their programs of teacher preparation and to attract dedicated and capable young people to teach the disadvantaged who would not otherwise consider a teaching career. A recent evaluation study indicated that the program has been reasonably successful in attracting and retaining capable young people in teaching careers and in changing teacher preparation methods in some participating colleges and universities.

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) also has as one of its chief aims the improvement of teacher quality through attracting low-income persons to new careers in schools serving low-income families. COP trainees serve as education aides and can move up the career ladder and receive training leading to full certification. The program is new and no formal assessment has been made. Preliminary studies indicate that it is meeting its objectives in terms of attracting as trainees low income participants who are residents of the communities where they are serving, encouraging over 7000 schools to hire COP trainees as auxiliary teachers, giving employment to over 800 veterans, and showing that low-income people can participate at the college level successfully and perform successfully in the classroom. A variety of other programs including the Attracting Qualified Persons to the Field of Education Program (Part A, Section 504, EPDA), the Educational Leadership Program (Part D, Section 531, EPDA), the School Personnel Utilization Program (Part D, Section 531, EPDA) the Training of Teacher Trainers Program (Part D, Section 531, EPDA), and the Teacher Development for Desegregating Schools Program (Part D, Section 531 EPDA) are all aimed at improving the selection, training and retraining of teachers. The success of the individual programs has been mixed, but collectively they represent the many alternatives to improvement in teaching quality.

In higher education, the National Defense Education Act Fellowships have had a substantial impact on the increased supply of qualified college instructors in disciplines ranging from the hard sciences to the humanities. Funds for the training of post-secondary educational personnel under the Education Professions Development Act are targeted on developing institutions and community colleges.

> Preliminary evidence indicates that the personnel benefitting from the program have entered the targeted institutions.

The assessments we have made of these programs have resulted in the decision to make fundamental changes in our research and development strategy. First is the proposal, now being considered by the Congress, for the establishment of the National Institute of Education to improve the quality and relevance of educational research and development. Second is the proposed establishment of a National Foundation for Post Secondary Education to help colleges and universities develop innovations in their structure and curricula. Thus, the NIE is designed to overcome traditional weaknesses in the research and development program while the NFPSC would fill a critical gap in providing seed money for reforms in post-secondary education. Both agencies would also seek to develop alternatives to traditional schooling. These proposals would transfer most of the current educational research and development activity to new agencies which would be better organized, staffed and funded to carry on these activities.

Other changes involve a basic restructuring and redirection of those reform and renewal activities that will remain with the Office of Education if and when the establishment of the NIE and NFPSC occurs -- such activities as implementation, demonstration and installation of research products and related training of educational personnel. Dissemination activities will be performed in conjunction with NIE. In this restructuring most of the project grant programs of the Office of Education are being brought together under the Deputy Commissioner for Development so that these efforts can be better integrated and targeted on resolving educational problems. These include existing programs such as Bilingual Education, Dropout Prevention, Teacher Corps, Education Professions Development, Follow Through, Drug Abuse Education, Right to Read and Environmental Education. They also include new or drastically reorganized activities such as Educational Renewal Sites, Dissemination, Exemplary Career Education Models and Educational Technology. In regard to these latter:

Educational Renewal Sites are being established in local school districts to provide developmental and technical assistance to school systems and school personnel in effecting educational improvement and reform. Initially a limited number of local sites will be established to assess local school needs, determine priorities, develop local programs integrating appropriate Federal funds, train and retrain teachers in new skills and methods areas and adopt new proven improvements and reforms.

The expanded Dissemination program has been discussed above.

The Career Education program, also a central component of the renewal effort, is discussed below.

The technology program is being given new direction and emphasis. It is clear that inadequate use has been made of technology in many of our educational systems, and there is a need to capitalize on technological developments to improve both teaching and learning. Thus we are supporting demonstrations of applications of technology as alternatives to conventional instructional systems.

These alternatives include satellite operations, cable TV, instructional programming and other telecommunication applications focused on improving delivery systems.

3. Selected General Support

The Office of Education administers a number of programs that provide general support to schools. These include impact aid, construction and equipment programs, basic grants to States for vocational and adult education, aid to land-grant colleges, public library programs and the purchase of school and college library materials. About 20% of the OE budget is allocated to these programs. In view of the limited Federal role in supporting operational activities and higher educational priorities, the Federal policy has been to hold the line on these programs or retarget them for specific purposes.

Since these are general support programs, it is difficult to assess their effectiveness except in terms of providing Federal funds to help schools and universities meet operational requirements in the areas mentioned. In general, this purpose has been achieved. The construction programs have helped meet the facilities needs of colleges and universities although they have not been able to meet some of the needs of the black colleges. The equipment programs have enabled school systems, colleges and libraries to purchase needed books and instructional equipment, but there is some case study evidence of supplies and equipment purchased and not being effectively used. We have recommended that the equipment programs be phased down.

The various library programs also seem to be helping the libraries meet their operational needs in serving the general population. However, impact data about the effectiveness of library programs in meeting the needs of various target groups such as the disadvantaged has not been collected. Studies are in process to provide this information.

Impact data on the State grant programs is lacking, but there is evidence that the Federal programs provide a substantial portion of the funds for these programs and some would probably be reduced in scope or curtailed without the Federal support.

The Impact Aid Program ($550 million in FY 71), provides local school districts with funds to compensate for the absence of tax revenues in Federally impacted areas. The program has served this general purpose, but a major evaluation study indicated that the distribution formula now in use often results in large sums of funds going to already wealthy school districts. Both the present and previous administrations have made recommendations to the Congress that the formula be modified so as to provide more equitable compensation for revenue losses due to the presence of Federal installations. The Impact Aid Program can also be considered as serving to help equalize educational opportunity.

The Vocational Education Basic Grant to States program is a formula grant program with the objective of assuring that education and training programs for career vocations are available to all individuals who desire and need such training for employment. There is a 15% set-aside for the disadvantaged and a 10% set-aside for the handicapped. Although national effectiveness data is not available, traditional vocational education apparently suffers from a negative image and has not attracted first-rate students. There is also some question whether vocational programs are attuned to local as well as national manpower needs. As a result of assessments of this program, in conjunction with the clear need to reform the basic thrust of secondary education to provide a more relevant educational experience, vocational education programs are being redirected and incorporated within the larger development of career education as a major reform thrust. The Career Education program has been designed, therefore, to prepare students for a successful life of work by improving the basis for occupational choice, facilitating the acquisition of job skills and enhancing educational achievement by making education more meaningful and relevant to the aspirations and expectations of students. Although aimed at all educational levels, the program is intended to reform the secondary school curriculum and also overcome the poor image now attributed to traditional vocational education programs. Much of the current effort is focusing on the development of four career education models; school based, employer based, home/community based and residential institution based.

Conclusion

These then constitute summary assessments of the programs that support the three principal thrusts of the Office of Education, equalizing educational opportunity, improving the quality and relevance of American education and providing limited general support to selected educational functions and activities. The next section contains more detailed descriptions and effectiveness information about each of the programs.